

# THE RAMBLER.

---

VOL. V. *New Series.* SEPTEMBER 1861.

---

PART XV.

## THE CATHOLIC ACADEMY.\*

THE appearance of this polished and eloquent discourse claims our attention on account both of the distinguished personage whose views on a very important question are expressed in it, and of the occasion and the purpose for which it has been written. From the beginning of the century a Society has existed in Rome, to which for more than thirty years the Cardinal has belonged, and whose labours are dedicated to the illustration and defence of the Catholic and Christian faith. Founded at a period which witnessed the almost unexampled combination of persecution with the prostration of religion, and in which weakness and coldness of faith united with the most bitter animosity to afflict the Church, the Catholic Academy has been one of the instruments of the revival of a better spirit, and has enjoyed the countenance and support of many of the most eminent persons in Rome. The object of its members has been to promote the reconciliation of religion with the advancement of learning, and at the same time to initiate in these studies the educated youth of the city. If we may draw an inference from what we hear and from what we do not hear, it would appear that the last of these objects has been more successfully attained than the former. The good that has been done seems to be principally confined to the society of the capital, and the printed acts of the Academy have not become

\* *Inaugural Discourse pronounced at the First Meeting of the Academy of the Christian Religion, June 29, 1861, by His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Burns and Lambert.*

widely known. So many reasons for this are at once suggested by the circumstances of place and time that have surrounded its institution, that it by no means follows either that the plan is radically defective, or that it would not achieve greater success and wider utility in another sphere.

Dwellers on the outer frontier of Catholicity, surrounded by an atmosphere of unbelief and hatred, and exposed to dangers both of attack and temptation against which the Church has always endeavoured to protect those who live in the centre of the fold, we might be justified in envying our brethren in the Eternal City an institution which, as a safeguard, we require more than they do, and which we have, in some respects, greater means of using as a weapon for the intellectual support of religion. In no country would there be a better field for its action, or more ample conditions of success, than in England. The object of the Academy is not controversy ; it does not address itself to those who are out of the Church, but seeks to digest and to assimilate the results of scientific inquiry, and to maintain the harmony of sacred and secular science. The Catholic body amongst us has especial need of a work of this kind, and possesses the materials for it ; and it is one of its greatest misfortunes that no such combination for a definite purpose subsists among its members. It is a consequence of the very advantages of our position, though it detracts from them, that the elements which are united in the Catholic Church in England are of such various derivation that we do not possess even common prejudices, the very lowest symbol of unity ; and the bonds of faith and of charity are not always powerful enough to secure either the necessary agreement, or the freedom of discussion, or the tolerance of differences enjoined by the well-known Protestant maxim which Catholics have consecrated by attributing it to St. Augustine. The cultivation of literature in a spirit inseparable from Catholicism, and on a basis which no Catholic refuses to acknowledge, is perhaps at the present time the only way that could be devised of reconciling, in a higher harmony, divergencies which proceed partly from the contrast of early education and partly from an imperfect and unequal conception of the present position of the world and its works in relation to the Church. It is an enterprise which, in the beginning, contradicts no opinions, and in the end must reconcile them. When, therefore, Cardinal Wiseman undertook to establish in England a branch of the Roman Academia, he planted it in a soil prepared to receive it, where it has a vast opportunity



of doing good, and in which, if it is only understood, it ought surely to thrive.

The Inaugural Address consists of two parts. The topic of the first portion is the idea that the Church has encouraged and adopted all that was most admirable in the secular movements of different ages, and has enriched herself with the best treasures of the outer world. Unchanged herself, she received and retained the impression of all that touched her. "Such has been the Church in every age. Whatever is good, whatever virtuous, whatever useful in the world, at every time, she has allowed to leave its seal upon her outward form" (p. 20). There are some considerations suggested by this passage which it is important that the Society to whom it was addressed should not overlook.

In speaking of the temporal action of the Church, or of her successes in spiritual things, it behoves us to define and to distinguish, and to eschew generalities which disguise a truism or conceal a fallacy. The divine purpose, which is her essential mission, she can never fail to fulfil; and in pursuing it, she has accomplished innumerable secondary and collateral ends, and, while teaching the transitoriness of all earthly things, has conferred immeasurable temporal benefits on mankind. But it is not this that constitutes her proper vocation, and it is not just to dwell on this in supporting her claims to the reverence and gratitude of those who do not believe in her. In comparison with the higher duty she discharges for the world, the encouragement at one time or another of literature or of agriculture, of art or of commerce—merits which are a primary subject of consideration in discussing polytheism or Islamism—are altogether insignificant and imperceptible. Nor, if this human point of view is put prominently forward, would it be fair to say that men are under obligations to her for all the things which constitute terrestrial advantages, or that in every thing in which religion can affect civilisation, Christianity surpasses every other system in a degree at all proportionate to her intrinsic superiority. In these matters her influence has not been always alike, nor her policy consistent or always in harmony with her nature. It belongs both to her character and her interest to require the development of literature and science for the performance of her own great intellectual work, and to promote political liberty because it is the condition of her social action. There were times when she did both these things, and then a time came when that part of her influence was abandoned to those who were not of her. Then the two great forces, freedom and know-

ledge, were converted into weapons of assault ; they seemed to justify while they avenged the neglect, and, in spite of Protestantism, they prospered better among Protestants than among Catholics. In England the spirit of political liberty, in Germany the spirit of scientific research, overcame the barriers of religious antagonism, and as it were spontaneously did homage to the Church, and protested against their estrangement from her. Human learning has often been an instrument, but not a source, of hostility to religious truth. It has served it in spite of great outward difficulties, of a long separation, and of a heavy bribe, and it has acted as a corrosive to all false religions ever since the time when the gods of Greece began to wane before the rising brightness of her philosophy. And this is a character of the present age which we are hardly accustomed to consider, and which we have not used as we might for the advantage of our cause, that learning has acquired an authority before which even religious rancour must give way, and is an ally to the Church that would be more powerful if it was more trusted. So long as its alliance is not claimed by the truth, it is certain to be used against it.

*Cain.* I never  
 As yet have bowed unto my father's God ; . . .  
 Why should I bow to thee ? . . .  
*Lucifer.* He who bows not to Him has bow'd to me.  
*Cain.* But I will bend to neither.  
*Lucifer.* Ne'ertheless,  
 Thou art my worshipper: not worshipping  
 Him makes thee mine the same."

The great error of the day, in reference to the position of the Church between science and policy, is that Catholics, men of science, and politicians are inclined to recognise only one authority. In the domain of learning, as well as in civil society, there is an authority distinct from that of the Church, and not derived from it, and we are bound in each sphere to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. There can be no conflict of duties or of allegiance between them, except inasmuch as one of them abandons its true purpose, the realisation of right in the civil order, and the discovery of truth in the intellectual. Political wrong and scientific error are the only sources of hostility in either department to the Church, and this is met by the restoration of right or of truth, that is, by the advancement of politics or of learning. If we neglect this, we are ourselves responsible for disputes and conflicts in which the right may not be on our side, and we shall have no criterion to apply but that which we



believe to be the interest of religion ; forgetful that a true principle is more sacred than the most precious interest, and that the consideration of interests is suspended where the obligation of principles is acknowledged. The danger comes from those who consider only one thing, and take their stand exclusively either on the secular or on the ecclesiastical ground. All that we demand is that science should be true to its own method, and the state to its own principle, and beyond this the interests of religion require no protection.

From the second part of the discourse we learn that this and no other is the spirit in which the English branch of the Academy has been instituted. The Cardinal exhorts its members to follow, "without anxiety, but with an unflinching eye, the progress of science." The perversion of learning alone must be resisted and exposed, but the spirit of investigation is to be humbly, joyfully, and gratefully accepted ; and the day will hereafter come when men will look with admiration upon its works, and upon the important part it has had in promoting the progress of religion. The rise of this new and mighty power, due in great measure to the lull of religious controversy at a time when Protestantism had lost its vigour, and the Church seemed to be absorbed in her internal troubles, is justly compared to the revival of ancient learning in the fifteenth century. That, too, was a new and powerful element in civilisation which might and did accomplish both great evil and great good, and which was viewed by some with confidence, by others with alarm, and by many with satisfaction as a welcome auxiliary against the Church. Then as now, in presence of a somewhat similar phenomenon, the Catholic world resolved itself into three sections. There was a large party, who knew that all the resources of criticism and learning belong to the armoury of the Church, and who greeted in the new discoveries a valuable accession to her strength. This was the feeling that for a hundred years uniformly prevailed in Rome ; it was shared by the most illustrious prelates of that age, by Ximenes, by Lindanus, by John Dalberg, by Giberti, and by the two great cardinals of the House of Borromeo ; and the author of this discourse, whose name is in the foremost rank of those who have combined elegant literature with severer learning, naturally ranges himself on their side. Then there was a party in which it would be unjust to place Erasmus, because his satire of the clergy that so readily accepted the doctrines and precepts of the Reformation was at least redeemed by his dogmatical opposition to Luther,



who, seeing nothing but paganism in antiquity, followed it instead of Christianity, and beheld in the clergy a set of ignorant and selfish conspirators against knowledge. Such were the authors of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, who, although the publication of the first volume preceded by two years the outbreak at Wittenberg, became Protestants for the most part, and whose ridicule of the priesthood was in intention and in reality an insult to the Church. Lastly, there were those whose conduct justified the attacks it drew down on them, who feared and deprecated the introduction of the new studies. But few men of note in the Church shared these views, and it is not probable that they will find favour in the Academy, if the traditions of its inauguration and the spirit of its founder survive in it. Much may be expected from the pursuit of literature by a body of earnest Catholics, who are impressed with the conviction that the harmony of religion with profane learning cannot be made, but may be found; who regard scientific investigation as a suspension rather than an occasion of controversy; and who understand that an important preliminary towards encountering with success the anti-Catholic prejudices of scientific men is, the suppression of an unscientific tendency among Catholics. For knowledge, says Thomas à Kempis, has no enemy but the ignorant. "Truth," says John of Salisbury, "becomes obscured as often by the negligence of those who profess it as by the assaults of error."

When Frederic Schlegel concludes his *Philosophy of History* with a chapter on the general restoration as the predominant sign of the age, he touches upon the great point of resemblance between the present time and the period of the Renaissance. For the development of the scientific spirit has proceeded from a revival of forgotten knowledge as comprehensive as that of the fifteenth century, and by the resurrection of a buried world whose influence is as profound and as important for civilisation as that of the ancients. The antiquity that was brought to light was partly Christian and partly pagan, but it was a period of civilisation deformed by corruption, and of Christianity beset with heresy. The influence of the revival corresponded to this character. It was in the first place æsthetical rather than practical. We still associate with the word *Renaissance* above all the notion of art. The Humanism of Italy was a study of beauty, of enjoyment, of refinement; what was beautiful was placed before what was true. The bearing of these pursuits on actual life was generally injurious. We need not point for proofs of this to the erotic

literature of the fifteenth century, or to the demoralisation of the courts ; they are most visible in the ideas of politics and of government which were derived from the ancients. The example which the history of their state supplies is only a lesson of false republicanism, generating in its corruption an unlimited despotism. Even the increased insight into the early period of the Church, though it modified and enriched the scholastic teaching, promoted only an archaeological and fragmentary, not a complete, historical study of Christianity. The connection with the immediate past was interrupted, and the continuity of institutions, the genesis and succession of ideas, were completely lost sight of. A time came when the ancients were the only authorities, antiquity the only study, and when the thousand years that separated its restoration from its fall were as little understood as the classic world had been during the supremacy of the barbarians who destroyed it.

The spirit of investigation was rapidly absorbed by the passion of formal elegance. At one moment it appeared as though it would be otherwise, but the first efforts of criticism, eminently characteristic of the times, were not followed up. In the middle of the fifteenth century, Valla wrote a treatise to prove that the Donation of Constantine could not be genuine, and in this he easily succeeded, though it was reserved for our time to ascertain the origin of the forgery which gave Ireland to England, and the Indies to Spain. The result of Valla's skill was merely negative. Finding in the period whose records he had studied no authority for the existence of the pontifical state, and certain of the spuriousness of its most famous title-deed, he conceived that the whole fabric of the temporal power was a usurpation, and insisted that it ought to be surrendered. "Men say," he writes, "that the Church is at war with Bologna or Perugia. It is not the Church but the Pope, of his own ambition, that is at war with the towns." But the Pope was not alarmed by the Humanists, and Valla obtained promotion at Rome ; but here a serious charge was brought against him, and he was denounced to the ecclesiastical authorities for that, puffed up with pride, and abandoning himself to an unseemly and hazardous temerity of statement, he taught that Tarquin the Proud was not the son of Tarquin the First. This was in the early period of the movement. It was not by criticism, but by frivolity and free-thinking, that the classical scholars did harm to religion ; their researches were dangerous neither to faith nor to credulity. It was in anticipation of such a change, which did not, however, actually ensue for centuries,



that Pius II. uttered a cautious saying, which is not in the tone of mediæval Catholicism, "*Christianam fidem, si miraculis non esset approbata, honestate sua recipi debuisse.*"

That anticipated innovation, which the classic revival failed to introduce, constitutes the essence of the corresponding revival of the 19th century. The most comprehensive and penetrating influence, which marks our age, as the Renaissance the age of Medici, and which is the strongest current that counteracts that which set in before the Revolution, is the restoration of mediæval learning. Its tendency is in almost every respect exactly contrary to the other revival. The ignorance of the middle ages, during the period between the Reformation and the Revolution, amounted to physical blindness. The remains of mediæval art were not even curiosities. An intelligent traveller could visit Cologne, describe several of the smaller churches, and declare that there was nothing else worth seeing in the place, though the cathedral towered above the city with that irregular and striking outline which all remember who saw it before the works were commenced for its completion. The great Gothic churches, it has been truly said, had to be discovered again like Pompeii, after lying hid for ages. The mediæval world was a palimpsest that had yet to be deciphered. Its history formed no part of education, and it was the great business of governments to obliterate all the traces it had left upon the state. Even in theology those who most faithfully preserved its forms were not likely to study its history. Its languages were extinct among the learned, and no man knew that they possessed a vast treasure of poetry, epic poets who could compare with Dante, and ballads such as in the hands of Percy and of Scott introduced a new era in the literature of England. The poetry of the romantic school, the art of the foreign pre-Raphaelites and of the Goths, are the most familiar outward tokens of a revolution immeasurably more profound and more extensive. The mediæval revival involves a return to continuity in social institutions, to tradition in ideas, and to history in science. The presiding impulse in this pursuit is the opposite of that which guided the Humanists. It is not the charm of beauty or of eloquence, for that is the privilege of antiquity, nor a delight in idle enjoyment, or even the cultivation of the mind; for in these things the middle ages have incomparably less to offer. We go back to the middle ages in order to know the realities of the past. The poverty of forms, the repulsiveness of style, restrict the inquiry to that which is alone of actual value, the facts of mediæval life. For the civilisation of that



age, its ideas, habits, and institutions, possess a direct importance for us who are its descendants and its heirs. Our society is the development of that of the mediæval chivalry; our civilisation is founded on theirs. Our national instincts and character were moulded by them. Our modern history has been occupied in destroying or modifying what they have left us; it is filled with the contest between mediæval facts which were no longer understood, and ancient ideas which had no basis in real life. The classical revival was the conquest of an unknown world. The mediæval revival is a pilgrimage to the homes of our fathers, to the graves of

“The dead but sceptred sovereigns, who still rule  
Our spirits from their urns.”

The heroes of the revival of letters went forth in the spirit of adventure, and are of the same type as the men who discovered a new world in the age that had revived the old. Ours is a spirit of reverence and piety, as of men returning after a long migration to places hallowed by the recollections and the traditions of their race.

The aim, then, of these studies is not beauty or pleasure, but truth and instruction. Their method therefore is critical, and their form is historical: for it is less the works of individuals that attract us than the general ideas and deeds of those days. A classical scholar has such a rich literary world before him that he may be any thing but a historian. But it is only for the historian that the bulk of mediæval literature has any attractions. Not only, therefore, does the study of the middle ages promote the historical art, and a stricter critical method than the classics, but it has given rise to a totally new feature in the moral sciences, the supremacy of the means over the end. Many problems about which men have disputed and fought naturally resolve themselves when considered as history. Numberless systems and opinions lose their absolute character, and appear in their conditional, relative truth, when the mode of their formation and the modifying influences of time and place are understood. Ecclesiastical history is filled with conflicts which a knowledge of the history of development would have made superfluous, and in all other branches of learning history is a peacemaker and a destroyer of idols. Until the middle ages were reinstated in their proper position, the scientific study of history was in its infancy; for the omission of a large and essential portion of the subject gave the rest a merely antiquarian interest, as a curiosity, not as part of a single and consecutive process to which the present belongs.

Religion has been served by this phase of literature in two ways. The least important is the rehabilitation of the ages of faith by its enthusiastic admirers, like Count de Montalembert and Mr. Digby. What is of far greater consequence is the establishment of those fixed rules, and of that disinterested spirit of investigation, which rigidly exclude the influence of prejudice, interest, or passion, pursue not the application of truth so much as its discovery, and apply to moral science something of the patient self-denial and closeness of observation which belongs to natural philosophy. If these qualities have been rare till lately in modern times, they were not unknown to an earlier age. Bishop Adelbold of Utrecht begins his life of St. Henry with the following definition of the duties of a historian: "*Scriptor veritatem tenere nequit nisi hæc quatuor aut potenter devitaverit, aut aliquatenus a mente deposuerit: odium et carnalem dilectionem, invidiam et infernalem adulationem. Odium enim et invidia bene gesta aut omnino tacent, aut dicendo transcurrunt, aut calumniose transmutant. E contra male gesta dicunt, dilatant et amplificant. Carnalis autem affectio et infernalis adulatio, quæ male gesta sunt, scientes ignorant et ignorantiam simulantes, veritatem occultant; bene gesta autem, placere quærentes, spaciose dicunt, et plus justo magnificant. Sic per hæc quatuor, aut in bene gestis aut in male gestis veritas evanescit, falsitas superducto colore nitescit. Spiritualis autem dilectio veritatis amica, nec male gesta celat, nec bene gesta pompose dilatat; sciens quia et male gesta sæpe prosunt ad correctionem, et bene gesta frequenter obsunt, dum ducuntur in elationem.*"

We gather from the names that have reached us of the members of the Academy that the moral sciences will be chiefly cultivated, for in the others few of course are really competent, and the interference of amateurs can only lead to a demoralising shallowness. It will be well if this is so, for those branches of learning are of more vital importance than physical science. They touch religion and morals more directly, and influence more powerfully men of cultivated minds, whilst illiterate persons are more easily struck with the facts and influences of the material world. It is, we presume, only for the facility of illustration, and perhaps from old reminiscences, that so many of the Cardinal's instances are drawn from geology and the physical creation. These sciences are of a subordinate utility to religion, even when cultivated in a religious spirit; and when directed against religion, have not the same force as the sciences which are connected with her origin, her history, and her doctrine.

Much will depend on the regulations which are to guide the Academy, and on the changes which will become necessary in order to adapt the original rule to new wants. As learning does not flourish even with protection so well as with freedom, no institution without some degree of self-government can retain an enduring vitality. The less it resembles a manufacture, and the more it obtains the character of an organism, the better it will fare. In the constitution of the French Consulate, the majority of the senate was originally appointed by the government, and it then completed its numbers by election. We know not whether this is the plan adopted by the Academy, but we have no doubt that the original list has been drawn up in conformity with the rule which was followed on that occasion. "We put aside," said the Third Consul, "all personal affection in our choice, and considered nothing but the merit, the reputation, and the services of the candidates."

The Academy of the *Lincei*, which is alluded to in the discourse, may supply some useful hints to the new association. Their historian, the Duke of Cezi, tells us that they were very different from the philosophers of our day; for they considered religion not only as the first of all sciences, but as the only safe basis, the principle, and true source of all knowledge,—an idea which is better expressed by a writer already quoted: "Quia tam sensus quam ratio humana frequenter errat ad intelligentiam veritatis primum fundamentum locavit in fide" (Metalog. iv. 41). Amongst their rules we applaud the following: "Non minus sedulo et hoc observent ne Lynceorum quemquam aut voce aut calamo perstringant, quorum tamen opiniones, ut amplectantur, non ob id adstringantur, cum cuilibet proprii genii, et ingenii modulo in hujusmodi disciplinis philosophari, et ad veritatem quam proxime collimare libere linqatur." It is easy to see that the *Lyncei* were not of the party who were disposed to give up religion and theology for the sake of an elegant Latinity.

The purpose of an academy has been defined to be to advance learning, whilst the mission of a university is to communicate it. This distinction, founded on the necessity of a fixed and finished matter for the instruction of youth, and of a direct religious control which the growth of science will not bear, did not originally subsist. The first academy was also the first university, and the name of the spot where Plato lectured on the banks of Cephissus has survived in both. We should think little of a university which did nothing for the enrichment of literature, and produced



men, and not books. But it has been usual for academies to addict themselves more exclusively to their own special function of acquiring, not of distributing knowledge; and it is not one of the least meritorious points in the Society of which we are speaking, that it returns in some manner to the old plan, and proposes to extend to younger men the advantage of witnessing its proceedings, and gathering something of its spirit. The majority of the academies which sprung up in every part of Italy, in consequence of the number of universities and the deficiency of public employment, can supply no useful example for the serious and practical design which the Cardinal is endeavouring to realise amongst us. The scheme of Leibnitz for the Academy of Berlin, the purpose of which was to advance at the same time the public good, learning, and religion ("un point des plus importants serait aussi la propagation de la foi par les sciences"), is the only one with which we are acquainted that combines such exalted ends.

---

#### THE LIFE OF DR. DOYLE.\*

THIS work, unquestionably one of the most valuable contributions recently added to our stores of Catholic biography, illustrates a period at once so near to our own, that its events largely influence that in which we live, and also so remote that it is rapidly passing out of the recollection of the existing generation. We will endeavour to indicate the importance of these memoirs to all who are interested in the recent condition or the future prospects of Catholicity among us. Dr. Doyle was well known in England as well as in Ireland. With many of the liberal statesmen who assisted in carrying Catholic Emancipation he was intimate; and from his conversation, as well as his writings, they derived many of the arguments by which they replied to the political bigots of those days. He preached the sermon at the consecration of Dr. Baines, and witnessed the beginning of that advance which Catholicity has made in England.

To his native land Dr. Doyle was attached by historical as well as religious ties; and patriotic aspirations were from the first intertwined with his devotion to the Church. He was the descendant of an ancient family, long settled in the

\* *The Life, Times, and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.* By William John Fitz-Patrick. James Duffy, Dublin and London.

neighbourhood of Wexford, which had been outlawed for its fidelity to James II., and which, after the confiscation of its property, had, in spite of the penal laws, retained its faith and held its ground in a condition of honourable poverty. Times that we look on as remote were to him as the days that preceded Catholic Emancipation are to us.

“How often,” wrote Dr. Doyle, in his letters on the state of Ireland, “have I perceived in a congregation of some thousand persons how the very mention of the penal code caused every eye to glisten! . . . . The very trumpet of the Last Judgment, if sounded, would not produce a more perfect stillness in any assemblage of Irish peasantry than a strong allusion to the wrongs we suffer.”\*

This circumstance is the key without which we shall fail to understand the remarkable career of Dr. Doyle, or to conceive that state of society which provoked from an antagonist who early learned to fear him, Dr. Magee, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, the flippant witticism, that “among the Roman Catholics of Ireland politics constituted a religion, and religion meant nothing beyond—politics.”

Dr. Doyle was born in the year 1786, at New Ross. Close to that place, in 1798, he witnessed one of the fiercest battles that took place during the Rebellion. His companion on this occasion was a boy of about his own age.

“Dr. Doyle, many long years after, in a conversation with his staunch friend, Father Martin, referred to this incident of their young days. ‘The only beating I ever got,’ he said, ‘was from you, while both of us lay concealed in the furze-bush.’ ‘You deserved it, my lord,’ was the reply. ‘Nothing would do for you but to be popping up your little black head after every volley, to see if the battle was over. I at last lost all patience, and belaboured you unmercifully with a hazel-switch. You lay pretty quiet afterwards,—*Deo gratias!*—for had our hiding-place been observed, we should in all human probability have been piked or bayoneted.’”†

In 1800, he was sent to a seminary then recently established in New Ross by Father John Crane, a member of the Augustinian Order, where he was more noted for studiousness than for natural quickness. Here he resolved to enter that Order; his preference for a career among the regular clergy having been not a little produced by his dislike to that species of maintenance upon which the secular clergy were then as now forced exclusively to depend. Upon the latter subject his views, at a later time, underwent a great modification; and, in spite of his love for the cloister, Providence had destined him for the most active career

\* Vol. i. p. 5.

† Vol. i. p. 9.

which a Catholic priest can know. In 1804, he lost his widowed mother.

"She was," remarks Mr. Fitz-Patrick, "in a great degree to him what Monica was to Augustine ; and we may attribute to the early instruction which she caused to be imparted to his tender mind, the germ of that breadth of brain and strength of piety which in after-life surprised the world."\*

In 1805, he entered on his novitiate in the Convent of Grantstown, a small thatched building, approached by a long avenue lined on either side by stately trees, and standing near the sea-shore, within some miles of Carnesore Point, which forms the junction between the eastern and southern coast of Ireland, and near the ruins of an ancient monastery belonging to the Eremites of St. Augustine. The next year he made his vows. The laws prohibiting Catholic education had been repealed in 1782 ; but, preferring a foreign education, which at a later time he speaks of as a thing calculated to enlarge the mind, and increase, not diminish, the student's love for his own country, he placed himself in the then celebrated university of Coimbra.

Here he found memorials in abundance equally apt to excite his devotion and his patriotism. Here Archbishop Talbot, of Dublin, and Father Luke Wadding had studied ; and here an Irish college had been founded by Dominick O'Daly, of Kerry, the historian of Catholic persecution in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. In this beautiful retreat the future Bishop laid the foundation of that extensive knowledge which afterwards distinguished him. That retreat was not, however, exempt from its dangers. The Voltairian philosophy even here had found entrance. The youthful stranger from Ireland breathed for the first time an atmosphere tainted with that poison of infidelity which, issuing out of France, had infected so large a part of Europe. But he did not fall. His studies convinced him that the philosophy then so fashionable was as superficial as it was brilliant. At a later time he said :

"I recollect, and always with fear and trembling, the danger to which I exposed the gifts of faith and Christian morality which I had received from a bounteous God."

A short time afterwards we find him, with a fellow-student, serving in the English army, with sword for book, against the French invader, and acting as an interpreter. Such were the vicissitudes of that time, and such the rough training, by

\* Vol. i. p. 13.



which he was prepared for a stormy career made peaceful only through that religion which consecrated it. The Portuguese government soon discovered the abilities of their young recruit, and made him magnificent offers, on condition of his placing his services finally at their disposal. But he remembered his vows, recorded in the little chapel at Grantstown, and forsook the caresses of a court for spiritual labours, not among the feudal and royal splendours of Alcobaco, with its 800 rooms, its library of 50,000 volumes, its statues and courts, towers and gardens, but among the desolate hovels of his native land. He returned to Ireland in 1808. It is thus that he describes his country at that period :

“ I have read of the persecutions by Nero, Domitian, Genseric, and Attila, as well as of the barbarities of the 16th century. I have compared them with those inflicted on my own country ; and I protest to God that the latter, in my opinion, have exceeded in duration, extent, and intensity all that has ever been endured by mankind for justice's sake. These Catholics are now emerging from this persecution, and—like the Trojans who had escaped, with their household gods, to the shores of the Adriatic, or the Jews after returning from the captivity—they are employed with one hand in defending themselves against the aggressions of their implacable enemies, and, with the other, in cleansing the holy places, rebuilding the sanctuary, making new vessels for the sacrifice, and worshiping at their half-raised altars. The recollection of their past sufferings is far from being effaced. The comparative freedom which they enjoy is a relaxation of pressure rather than a rightful possession. As religionists they are suffered to exist; and the law restrains the persecutor, but persecutes them of itself. They are obliged to sweat and toil for those very ministers of another religion who contributed to forge their chains.”\*

The tithe-grievance, here alluded to, was one of the scandals which Dr. Doyle denounced in his writings with the sternest hostility. The tithe-commutation has removed from the peasant its *direct* pressure, and saves him from many incidental cruelties with which the injustice was formerly embittered to his feelings. It is needless to observe that the substantial wrong continues to exist. That charge upon the land which belonged neither to the proprietor nor to the occupier, but was set apart as a religious, educational, and charitable endowment for the benefit of those living on the land, is still diverted from its proper objects, and paid over, though by another hand, for the purpose of maintaining the clergy of a small, comparatively wealthy, minority, and of a novel creed. Yet the strength with which Dr. Doyle felt

the wrongs done to his country and Church never prompted him to any uncharitable course. As far as mutual coöperation (not to speak of mutual good-will) was possible between Catholics and Protestants, he ever wished to promote it. At New Ross, he became a member of a committee composed of persons belonging to different religious denominations, and instituted for charitable ends. He remarked at a later time, "Great harmony prevailed among the different religionists in that town, and I think this was mainly owing to the Protestants and Catholics meeting every week, and acting together for a charitable purpose." When establishing schools in his diocese, he especially provided that Protestant children should, if they pleased, share in the instruction there given, without, however, the slightest interference with their religion.

From his Augustinian Convent at Ross, Dr. Doyle was removed, in the year 1813, to the College of Carlow, which had suddenly been reduced to great difficulties, very humorously described by Mr. Fitz-Patrick, by the abrupt departure of a divinity professor. There he remained, every year increasing in reputation, until March 1819. One day, as he was walking in the College Park, saying his office, some of the priests belonging to that institution advanced to meet him, and, to his great astonishment, saluted him as Bishop elect, informing him that he had been recommended to the Pope by the clergy of Kildare and Leighlin, who had discarded all local claims and interests in favour of one known to them only by fame. Their choice was gladly confirmed by Pius VII.; and then began that episcopate which, till death terminated it in 1834, diffused over the whole Irish Church a splendour long unknown to it; which had strengthened the brave, and changed some who had previously occupied the contradictory and almost ludicrous position of *timid Catholics* into men proud of their Church, and to her no cause of shame.

We have made these references to the earlier part of Dr. Doyle's career because it is less known than that portion of it which followed, and because we who live in comparatively easy times cannot but be the better for remembering upon what basis rested the greatness, and out of what trials rose the eminence, of those who now, indeed, are spoken of with reverence by all,—nay, who are often invidiously contrasted with the very men, of those now living, perhaps their nearest counterparts,—but who in their own day had to sustain, in abundant measure, not only the hostility of avowed enemies, but, what is more difficult to bear, misconception among friends. In his subsequent career he was mixed up in all



the great questions which bore directly or indirectly on the interests and honour of his country. To but a few of these we can at present refer. His conduct with respect to several of them has been misapprehended by some, who seem to find it equally difficult to understand, on the one hand, that truth is one and doctrine immutable, and to perceive, on the other, that what belongs to the lower sphere of expediency varies with times and seasons. In these latter cases a man's principles, being subject to modifications in practice, can only be understood so far as he has definitely asserted them as *principles*.

One of the great questions of Dr. Doyle's day, as of ours, was education. The Catholics were then far less able than they have since become either to provide schools for themselves, or to demand assistance upon just terms from the government. It was also in a large measure through the schools of the Kildare-Street Society that proselytism was then carried on. These were the circumstances under which somewhat of a compromising spirit might have been expected. How little the principles of Dr. Doyle permitted of such compromise may be inferred from such passages as the following:

“ ‘ I have always considered the education of the poor as an essential means of bettering their condition, and of promoting the peace of society and the security of the state. . . . Literature might become in some measure here what it is in Scotland, the staple manufacture of the country, and add, not only to her fame, as hitherto, but even to her improvement and wealth. . . . The only education not an *evil in itself*, and which can promote the advantages I have stated, appears to me to be that which regards the mind and the heart, by uniting the *religious with the literary* improvement of the people.’ ”

Dr. Doyle proceeded to observe, that ‘the first and most essential stipulation to make was, that the priest should be allowed to visit these schools, as often as he should deem necessary, in order to ascertain that the religious education of the children is attended to.’ Next, that the master must be a Roman Catholic; and ‘with regard to the books of instruction to be used, you will adhere strictly to the established usage of our Church. Therefore, declare explicitly to the gentlemen concerned, that no books shall be introduced for the use of the Catholic children which are not approved by their pastors.’ ”\*

Here and elsewhere is the same distinct assertion of pastoral authority which was made in Mr. Stanley's celebrated letter, announcing the system of national education,

\* Vol. i. pp. 110, 111.



before it had become the fashion to assume that parental authority and pastoral authority were likely to be at variance, and that parents and children were to find at the hand of patrons and masters of a different creed a protection from the undue religious interference of their own clergy. These quotations are taken from a letter of Dr. Doyle's, published in the *Carlow Post*, January 1820.

It was because these principles were violated by the Kildare-Street Society that Dr. Doyle denounced it. In 1823, we find him writing thus to Sir Henry Parnell :

"The present Parliamentary grants for the education of the poor are fully sufficient for their object, if well administered and made available for the purposes intended by the legislature ; but as they are now employed, they serve to generate discord, heart-burnings, and almost a civil war in every village. God knows what sacrifices I have made, and almost every Catholic prelate in the kingdom, to allay passions excited by persons who, with probably the best intentions, are labouring to educate the poor according to a system opposed to their conscience. We *even overlook what we can never approve*, rather than offend or cause irritation, hoping that the Government would adopt a wiser course, and not through any want of ability to defeat the Kildare-Street System ; for by an address not longer than this letter, I could induce the Catholic poor of the Dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin to withdraw all their children. . . . It is to me unaccountable why a government, which ought to look only to the peace and happiness of the people, should not seek to educate the poor without interfering with their faith."\*

With what a cry of "Ultramontane" would not the Bishop, claimed by some as a "Gallican," be received, if now living and making statements like these ! "But," it will be answered, "though he disapproved of the Kildare-Street System, he approved that which succeeded it." Just so ; and let us assume that he would have approved of it no less when the same Liberal party, which had advocated the "Appropriation Clause," introduced the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill." What then ? The new system was distinctly founded on the *three principles* he had so pertinaciously asserted. Education was to be religious in every case, not secular only. The Catholic priest was to have access to his children in all the schools. No child was to be dependent, *for his religious instruction*, on persons of a faith opposed to that of his parents and pastors. Does it follow that Dr. Doyle would have equally approved of changed rules, through which in many cases the pastor may not visit the school, and the Catholic child must receive his religious instruction from masters of

\* Vol. i. pp. 223-4.

a different faith, or in which, if he objects to this, he must content himself with that exclusively secular education which the Bishop pronounced to be the greatest of all evils?

In the autumn of 1824, Dr. Doyle published his *Letters on the State of Education in Ireland, and on the Bible Societies*.

"He complained," Mr. Fitz-Patrick says, "that foundations for education had been turned into sinecures; that the very few diocesan and parochial schools which existed were accessible only to those who could pay; that charter schools aimed notoriously at the religious proselytism of the people; that Catholics were excluded from every endowed school, or exposed in them to the mental training of a master professing a different religion, or perhaps no religion at all, 'whilst their own creed might be spit upon and buffeted by every zealot who believed that, in so doing, he rendered a service to God and the State.'"\*

To the cry of "priestcraft" then raised against Dr. Doyle, as now against those who, in a changed time, have not swerved from the three great essential principles he then contended for, Dr. Doyle thus replies:

"Do we wish or require to be intrusted with the public instruction? No; we seek only that the portion of it which regards ourselves be intrusted to us; we do not desire to put our sickle into another man's harvest; all we require is, that you observe the commandment of Christ: 'Whatever you wish that men do to you, do you to them in like manner.' You would not confide the instruction of your children to us; do not oblige us to intrust ours to you. As to the State bestowing aid, we feel indebted for it: we shall not even think, if you will, that the State exists only for the good of the people; that we are its subjects; that we pay its taxes; supply its luxuries; bear all its burdens; fight and die for its aggrandisement or glory. We will waive all right to the public money, and sit, like Lazarus, expecting the crumbs. All this we will do; only do not afflict us by interposing your authority between us and our children; do not estrange from us the mind or affection of our little ones, or teach them from their infancy to regard the stranger as entitled to their confidence; do not intimate to them that their parent and pastor are unfit to train their mind, and form their heart, or introduce them to the world. If your object be to seduce them from the faith for which they have suffered, and into which they have been baptised, tell us so, and we will retire with them into the desert, and tell our misfortunes to the rocks; or we will cease to beget children in our bondage, and let our name be forgotten, and our race extinguished."†

In his great Pastoral for 1826, the Bishop sounded a yet

\* Vol. i. p. 353

† Vol. i. p. 356.



bolder note. He traces historically the long series of attempts, now by violence, now by fraud, to seduce Catholics from their faith. Coming down to later times, he says :

"This policy has yielded somewhat to the force of time and events ; it has assumed a meeker tone ; but in deceit, in craft, in injustice, as well as in hostility to the faith of the 'Island of Saints,' it has undergone no change. . . . Shall Ireland no more be Catholic and orthodox ? Yes, brethren, it shall ; and rather than desert the faith once delivered to the Saints, let our right hand be withered, and our flesh given a prey to the beasts of the earth or the fowls of the air."\*

Whether the author of these passages, and many others far stronger, would have been contented to compromise what he had clearly shown to be *vital* and *essential principles* of education, we need not here raise a discussion. We know that he is sometimes spoken of in our day as a very lamb ; but in his own he was frequently denounced as a revolutionist, notwithstanding the notorious fact that in times of disturbance his Pastorals did far more to tranquillise the country than soldiers or police could do, and that on one occasion 300,000 copies of a Pastoral by him were published and circulated at the expense of the Government. Notwithstanding such tributes, the Rev. Sir Harcourt Lees had early denounced him as guilty of "malignancy, of blasphemy, and of treason ;" and affirmed that his purpose was "to irritate the lower orders in this superstitious country into acts of outrage against the Government ;" pronouncing the "Titular Bishop" an "impostor and a fool." His offence was this : Archbishop Magee, a prelate of great vivacity, and violently addicted to antithesis, had, in a Pastoral published in 1822, drawn a sublime and pathetic picture of that branch of the "United Church of England and Ireland" which is located in the latter country, affirming it to be the true descendant and representative of apostolic times, but lamenting that it was "hemmed in by two opposite descriptions of professing Christians,—*the one possessing a Church without what we can call a religion, and the other possessing a religion without what we can call a Church.*" Dr. Magee was a High-Churchman, and had expressed himself as wholly opposed to the principle of "the Bible without note or comment." Dr. Doyle replied to him under the well-known signature of "J. K. L. ;" and after refuting some of his calumnies against that Church upon the spoils of which he was living, and against which he was preaching a crusade, propounded to him the following unceremonious questions, at that time unusual :



"As an Archbishop of the Established Church, I would beg leave to ask you, my lord, who are you, and where did you come from? From what heaven have you fallen? What earth produced you? Turn over the records of your Church; tell us the names of the Bishops who preceded you; show us how they were connected with the Apostles, or with those who received the faith from them; produce your claim to that title of apostolic which you so ostentatiously put forth."

On one occasion Dr. Doyle used in a pamphlet language so strong, that some in his own community took alarm. He said,

"The minister of England cannot look to the exertions of the Catholic priesthood: they have been ill-treated, and they may yield for a moment to the influence of nature, though it be opposed to grace. This clergy, with few exceptions, are from the ranks of the people; they inherit their feelings; they are not, as formerly, brought up under despotic governments; they have imbibed the doctrines of Locke and Paley more deeply than those of Bellarmin, or even of Bossuet, on the divine right of kings; and they know much more of the principles of the constitution than they do of passive obedience. Such is the view which this country must present to the eye of British statesmen," &c.

Dr. Doyle was warned that such strength of language would produce a storm. He replied,

"The man who first stirs up these truths will be decried by all. The Government will fold itself in its strength and dignity, and make a show of severity and vengeance. But he is a fool who does not see that the truth works secretly, and, like a grain which must corrupt before it gives fruit, will, after it has suffered obloquy, produce advantage. I have exposed myself knowingly and willingly to danger," &c.

Part of Dr. Doyle's pamphlet was read aloud at Maynooth.

"The Irish professors present listened in silence; but the French theologians, Delahogue and Anglade, who had belonged in their own country to the *ancien régime*, at once pricked up their ears, and assumed a mingled expression of disgust and alarm. 'Mon Dieu,' exclaimed Delahogue, 'est ce possible qu'il prêche la Revolution?' 'La Revolution!' echoed Anglade, 'c'est horrible!'"\*

This was not the prelate whom statesmen most delight to honour, except at peculiar times, or after his death.

A disposition to subject the Church more or less to State interference has been attributed to Dr. Doyle by some as a merit, and by others as an error, only excused by the cir-

cumstances of his time. Neither the praise nor the censure will find much confirmation in these volumes. That such tendencies existed in the early part of this century is proved by the veto question. The royal veto having been finally refused by the Irish Church, even when emancipation was the inducement offered, Mr. Plunket, in the year 1821, in his ardent desire to carry emancipation, proposed to append to his Relief Bill another bill intended to give to Government what were then called "securities." This bill provided that before any one was appointed to be a Bishop or Dean in the Irish Church, his loyalty, &c. was to be decided upon by a board consisting of Catholic Bishops, two Privy Councillors, and the Secretary of State as president. Dr. Doyle was one of those who saw most quickly the danger sure to result from allowing the Government thus to introduce the end of the wedge, though he was willing to make every sacrifice not inconsistent with safety. He proceeded to Dublin, and submitted the documents in question to Archbishops Troy and Murray, the Bishop of Ferns, and several others of the assembled clergy. In accordance with his views, the meeting adopted resolutions condemning the proposed bill. Similar resolutions were soon after adopted at Limerick, by Bishop Tuoley and his clergy, and elsewhere, and the plan came to nothing. The concession party in the Irish Church was still strong; and had its counsels prevailed, the mischief thus done would hardly have been compensated for by any measure of political relief. It was indeed a time of danger, though the danger has been forgotten.

Another measure with which Dr. Doyle's name has been connected was the plan for endowing the Catholic clergy by means of a *regium donum*. On this subject considerable error seems to have at one time prevailed respecting his opinions. From many passages in the volumes before us it is made plain that his real sentiments were as follows, viz. that it is best that the clergy should continue to be maintained without any legal endowment whatever; that, if endowed at all, that endowment should consist in a rate or charge derived from the *land*, as does the present endowment of the Establishment; and that in any case a pension paid by the treasury, or in any manner connecting the clergy with the crown, is absolutely inadmissible. On this subject his opinion was given when examined before the Parliamentary Committees in 1825:

"The payment of the Catholic clergy by a *regium donum*, and the exercise of a veto by the crown in the appointment of Catholic Bishops, Dr. Doyle reprobated and rejected with the zeal of a true

churchman. He added, that he would be hostile to such an influence even if the sovereign of this realm were a Catholic.\*

During the same year, the Catholic Relief Bill was provided with two "wings," as they were called, in order to help in carrying the measure through the adverse atmosphere of prejudice. These wings were the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders, and the endowment of the Catholic clergy by means of a *regium donum*. It is thus that Dr. Doyle writes on the latter subject to Mr. Blake :

"With respect to the provision itself, it is perhaps superfluous to repeat that, let it be *of whatever kind or amount it may*, I would accept of it with great reluctance ; so much so, that I would certainly reject it if emancipation could be obtained on any other terms. . . . I have made this reflection in order to record, at least with you, that the mode of providing for the Catholic clergy in Ireland, which I have seen detailed on paper, was not devised by us, and though it may be submitted to, will never be approved of by, me. In the event of a provision being made, it should proceed on the principle of connecting the Catholic clergy, *not with the crown, but with the state*, and of preserving inviolate the mutual dependence and connection of the *priesthood and the people* with and upon each other. For this purpose an Act of Parliament might provide that the parishes now existing, or to exist hereafter in each diocese, should be classed by the Bishop, and that a vestry of each parish, composed of *Catholic freeholders*, should be enabled to vote, and levy by assessment from off the parish, an annual sum not exceeding £— for the maintenance of a parish-priest of the first class, and so on in proportion for those of the other classes."†

Dr. Doyle then stated objections against the principle of paying the priesthood out of the treasury, and added, "the Catholic clergy should be paid by those amongst whom their duties are performed." He next proceeds to show that the Protestants would not suffer any wrong in consequence of not being present and voting in the proposed vestries, although the rate would fall upon them no less than on Catholics.

O'Connell had given at one time his support to a certain proposition relative to the payment of the clergy, and defended his course by a reference to what he supposed to be the opinions of Dr. Doyle and Archbishop Murray. His statement was made at a public meeting in Carlow. The following eminently graphic account of what took place is given by Mr. Fitz-Patrick :

"The Rev. Martin Doyle had no sooner heard the allegation

\* Vol. i. p. 394.

† Vol. i. pp. 405, 406.



made, than he repaired to the college adjacent, and requested Dr. Doyle to come forward and deny it. 'I have already done so,' said the Bishop. The priest returned to the meeting. O'Connell was still speaking, and giving, as it would appear, implicit credence to some incorrect information which had reached him. He declared that, as the prelates did not disapprove of the 'wings,' the laity might well subscribe to them. A resolution was proposed in favour of the 'wings,' and a portion of the meeting, hungry for emancipation, seemed anxious to adopt them. The priest again sought his Bishop. . . . Dr. Doyle closed the Breviary which he had been reading, and, with a lofty severity of deportment almost ominous in its expression, unexpectedly entered the room. O'Connell abruptly ceased speaking as the Bishop approached. . . . 'As I was informed,' observed Dr. Doyle, 'before I entered this room that frequent mention had been made of my name, and of the assent which I was supposed to have given to the measure now under your consideration, I feel myself called upon to give such explanation with regard to that measure as may serve to remove from the minds of the gentlemen present any misconception under which they may labour. . . . What my opinion was I declared in London to my right reverend brethren. I repeated it since then in Dublin. I may have sometimes mentioned it in private conversation ; and it was this,—that if the prelates were led to approve of a provision emanating from the treasury,—if the ministers of Christ were to be paid by the Minister of State for dispensing the mysteries of God,—then in that case I would not create dissension among them ; but sooner than that my hand should be soiled by it, I would lay down my office at the feet of him who conferred it. For if my hand were to be stained by Government money, it should never grasp a crosier, nor should a mitre ever afterwards be fitted to my brow. This was and is my fixed determination.' . . . O'Connell atoned for the mistake into which he had been led by a respectful apology, while Dr. Doyle made his exit amid peals of applause. The resolution in favour of the clerical 'wing' fell to the ground.\*

The sequel respecting the coolness between the great Bishop and the great Tribune, together with their subsequent reconciliation, is not less interesting.

Taking into account the eminently practical character of Dr. Doyle's mind, there is some difficulty in understanding how such an idea as the "reconciliation of the Churches" can have seriously presented itself to him. That the proposed union was not to be attained by the aid of the slightest doctrinal compromise on the part of the Catholic Church need hardly be stated. Again and again Dr. Doyle had come forward as the triumphant champion of that Church which in doctrine knows no change. Many passages in Mr. Fitz-Pa-

\* Vol. i. pp. 441, 442.

trick's valuable memoir prove that the *doctrinal* concessions looked for were all to come from the other side.

"It was next observed, that some Catholics were exceedingly anxious lest he contemplated a compromise of their faith in his project of a union. Here the Bishop smiled, and said, 'I am too good a *Papist* to compromise any thing ; and if I sought to do so, there is not an old woman or a young child in the diocese who would not see my error and abandon it. No good can ever be effected by compromise ; and the nature of truth is to be unchangeable, and not to ally itself with error. . . . The doctrinal decisions of the Council of Trent could be received by the English Church without any considerable violence being done to articles of faith.' "\*

His mode of viewing the *theological part* of the matter would seem to have been this : he took the definitions of the Established Church and its Liturgy (the latter deduced chiefly from ancient sources, and the former very equivocally drawn up, for the purpose of including as many of the half-Catholics of the 16th century as could be induced to conform to the new order of things),—these he took, apart from the interpretation which time has placed upon them, and apart from that actual condition of religious belief which belongs to those who, unconsciously to themselves, find their theological guide neither in Prayer-Book nor Articles, Bible nor Concordance, but in that great prophet of modern times,—Public Opinion. This was taking the most favourable view of the Established Church. But with this view of its theological documents, Dr. Doyle seems to have combined another and less favourable one, respecting the Establishment itself as an actual institution. The latter he regarded, not as the real exponent of any theological system, but simply as a great and influential state instrument, which must find the best excuse it can for taking whatever course the state prescribes from time to time. When asked how the proposed religious change in the Established Church was to be effected, the Bishop simply replied by pointing to—Law !

"I could *frame a bill*, not so long as the Declaration of Rights, which, if *passed by Parliament*, would effect a union, and a union which would be more *useful to England than were her unions with Scotland and Ireland.*"†

The benefit to Ireland which Dr. Doyle anticipated was the union of classes. Political materialists see only what is on the surface of society. Dr. Doyle well knew that injustice, as regards religious institutions, was, as it still is, though in a less degree, the hidden but living root of almost all the

\* Vol. i. p. 336.

† Ibid.



animosities that internally distract Ireland, and that separate her from the empire at large.

"A person well acquainted with Ireland," he went on to say (this was in 1824), "would not find it difficult to show why the efforts made to better her condition have been fruitless, and why every benefit conferred on her by the legislature, or through the bounty of the English people, has had no corresponding effect. The whole frame of society among us is disorganised. . . . This state of the public mind and feeling is unquestionably produced by the inequality of the laws, and still more immediately by the incessant collision and conflict of religious opinions. . . . In Ireland, I am confident that, notwithstanding the ferment which now prevails, a proposition such as you have made, if *adopted by the government*, would be heartily embraced. The clergy of the Establishment are unpopular, and they feel it; they are without flocks, and every professional man wishes for employment; their property is attacked, and even endangered, for the State has touched it, and the people have no respect for it. The Dissenters have encroached on them; and the Catholic clergy have despoiled them, in many places, of their flocks. The proprietors and capitalists in Ireland are affected at the prospect which lies before them, and are anxious to establish peace and security amongst us."\*

The Bishop seems to have overlooked the fact that, if public interests be stronger than the theological definitions made by "private judgment," in its attempts to "cut a coat for the moon," yet animosities are often stronger than interests. Some such conviction seems, however, ere long to have forced itself on him, and chilled an aspiration which had probably recommended itself to him rather as a statesman than as a churchman; for Dr. Doyle was pre-eminently both. Soon afterwards we find him writing to a friend: "As to the union of the Churches, I told you I looked upon it as not attainable, unless by a miracle of grace." To Mr. Newenham, a Protestant, who had written to him from England with a friendly enthusiasm, the Bishop replies in a manner that indicates that it was not from theological discussion, but from diplomatic arrangement that he looked for aid in dealing with an establishment, the *theology* of which he regarded but as a sort of heraldic device and decoration: "If I could perceive a likelihood of the matter being taken into consideration by *Government*, I should not fail to labour for its advancement whenever I could find a moment's leisure."† The mere discussion of such a proposition, whether or not it be a practicable one, has of course abiding religious influences which at one period may be healthful and at another the reverse. The danger consists

\* Vol. i. pp. 321, 322.

† Vol. i. p. 331.



in the degree in which it may favour the notion that the Church and the sects, whether established or non-established, can be "high contracting parties," standing on a common ground, and that the former can make concessions besides those relating to discipline. On the other hand, Catholic doctrines can hardly fail ever afterwards to look very differently to a Protestant controversialist who has been induced, but for a few days, to divest himself of traditional prejudice, and to ask himself how nearly he can agree with them when he has come to understand them.

We lament being obliged to pass by many passages of Dr. Doyle's life recorded in these volumes, to which we can but refer the reader. Among these passages are the reforms which the young Bishop early made in his diocese, and some of which were carried out with the rigour of the apostolic times, though his clergy, so far from being alienated from him by this occasional severity, evinced, at a later period, their attachment by presenting him with a house and park which they had purchased at a cost of several thousand pounds. These reforms are treated of in pp. 98, 99, 117, 118, 120, 129, 277. They relate chiefly to clerical assiduity, costume, the majesty of divine worship, spiritual retreats, the priests' farms, and clerical bequests. On these subjects the depressed state of things left by the penal laws bequeathed a task to the reformer from which he did not shrink. Not less interesting are the passages that illustrate the personal devotion and manly piety of the Bishop. Those who have fancied he was a "liberalised" Catholic will find edification in the fervour with which he flung himself on his knees before the shrine of St. Bridget, on finding it still remaining in the ancient church, long since appropriated to Protestant use at Kildare. To the great patroness of his diocese his devotion was at all times ardent.\* Those who think that miracles which did not "happen a long time ago," with a promise not to recur, are improbable, superstitious, or not in good taste, will be surprised to find two of the miracles effected through the prayers of Prince Hohenlohe, solemnly attested by the two prelates they commonly regard as especially enlightened, viz. Bishop Doyle and Archbishop Murray, as having occurred in their respective dioceses, and as being especially worthy of the gratitude and veneration of the faithful.† His views as to foreign politics are always striking, as are his preference of free institutions with regard to the interests of religion, and his belief that the suppression of convents in Portugal would

\* Vol. i. pp. 134, 232.

† Vol. i. pp. 241-246.

but lead in time to the creation, as in France, of more numerous and more efficient convents.\* In the whole biography, perhaps, there is nothing more touching than the narrative given by the Bishop in a letter of his visitation in the year 1823.† It presents an extraordinary picture both of the present and of the past in Ireland. In the most remote part of his diocese he finds a people still as primitive in their ways, as pure in their morals, and as ardent in their piety as the early Christians themselves were; a people the elder among whom pointed out the haunts in which his predecessors had so often taken refuge from persecution, and where they themselves had heard Mass in a cave while their scout had kept watch on the hill.

His sermons preached in other dioceses upon occasions of great solemnity attest the esteem in which his eloquence was held; amongst others was one at the opening of the new Augustinian Church in Limerick, where he discharged, in 1823, the same part which another illustrious prelate discharged in the same city, when, after the lapse of centuries, a new Cathedral was opened there in 1861.‡

But the two prominent positions in which Dr. Doyle is presented to us in these volumes, are those of the vindicator of his Church and the defender of the people. Over the people he extends a double shield: he defends them from their foes, whether spiritual or temporal, and he defends them from themselves. Again and again his solemn and majestic Pastorals condemn and subdue, with the authority of a father, those insurrectionary movements which invariably aggravated the evil they endeavoured to resist; movements which were produced by misery, and met by the bayonet, in an age of chronic famine and a suspended *Habeas Corpus* Act. But no less searchingly does he point out to statesmen the source of the evil, and its only permanent cure; demanding a cessation of laws undeserving of respect, if respect for law is desired, and the introduction at once of a wisely-considered provision for the poor, of enactments calculated to stimulate and protect industry, and of that education which alone can direct it. To him justice was, as to Edmund Burke, an ever-present divinity, not a fable or a name.

“When I consider,” he writes in 1820, “this great principle, emanating from Him who is the fountain of all justice, existing before the Gospel, and to last to eternity; when I view it thus, and compare it with what is called by its name in Ireland, a thrill of horror pervades my blood, because we are all hastening to Him who

\* Vol. i. p. 188.

† Vol. i. p. 231.

‡ Vol. i. p. 249.



will judge us in justice, and weigh all our actions in the scales of the sanctuary."\*

In 1823 he writes in his fifth letter on the "State of Ireland" as follows :

"Without adopting the opinions of Mr. Owen, on the capability of this country to support eighteen or twenty millions of inhabitants, I am inclined to the opinion that its present population (then about 7,000,000) is not at all excessive; and that the Legislature might in a single session pass such laws as would, in the course of a few years, render the poor of Ireland, who now create so much anxiety and alarm, if not as comfortable as those of the same class in England, at least placed beyond the reach of want."†

Alas! such laws as he desired were not passed, or not passed in time. It is but last year that one of them, intended to protect the fruits of the farmers' industry, and thus develop the resources of the land, was sanctioned by Parliament. He foretold the consequence if successive governments persisted in the substitution of a cruel and blind empiricism for statesmanship, justice, and mercy. Mr. Poulett Scrope, in the famine of 1847, lamented that Dr. Doyle was not then alive. If he had been alive, he would but have witnessed the fulfilment of the following prophecy :

"If the policy of governing by division be pursued longer, then the people will perish by *famine, or emigrate to Great Britain, or be cut off by the sword*. If strong measures be resorted to, and some of the Irish gentry and absentees proceed as they have been doing, these results, or some one of them, will be accelerated. Captain Rock will resume his sway; the poor will instinctively confederate; the Insurrection Act will be in constant operation; and if a foreign war should occur, and circumstances favour it, there may be a general rebellion. What the result would be, God knows. I know that my office as a minister of religion, and my duty as a loyal subject, require that I should state my opinions at a time when effectual remedies may be safely applied; and I do so totally regardless of the slave and the bigot, nay, though I were doomed, like the prophetess mentioned by the poet, never to be believed. Or let it be supposed that the law, by the agency of the musket, the transport, or the gibbet, may still sustain the uneasy tranquillity of the country, and that the population should be pressed on, as heretofore, then they will congregate in towns and villages, finding no habitation or employment in the country; and should a dearth of provision occur, *famine and pestilence will set in together, and rid us probably of a million*. Happily we have missionaries in abundance to attend the dying; but if there be a chosen curse, some hidden thunder in the stores of heaven, it must be reserved to blast those men who shall have brought such a ruin upon their country."‡

\* Vol. i. p. 128.

† Vol. i. p. 252

‡ Vol. i. pp. 219, 420.



But the faith of his fellow-countrymen, and the honour of that faith, lay yet nearer to Dr. Doyle's heart than their material interests. In 1823 he addressed to Lord Wellesley his letter entitled *A Vindication of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Irish Catholics*. This work appeared at one of those periods of temporary depression in Ireland which have so often tempted those who do not know that permanent tranquillity must rest upon justice, to cry out "Peace, peace, where there is no peace." In 1829 Mr. Sheil thus contrasted the apathy of that time with the restored energy of later years, an energy which gave to Ireland her freedom, and removed from England her chief danger and her chief opprobrium.

"In 1823 an entire cessation of Catholic meetings had taken place. There was a total stagnation of public feeling, and I do not exaggerate when I say that the Catholic question was nearly forgotten. . . . The country was then in a state of comparative repose; but it was a degrading and an unwholesome tranquillity. We sat down, like galley-slaves in a calm."

Mr. Fitz-Patrick tells us that this new pamphlet "gave the first mortal stab to the tithe-system," of which Dr. Doyle, the most effectual enemy of sedition, and the most eloquent preacher of charity, has said, "May our hatred of tithes be as lasting as our love of justice." This theme he had previously touched in his reply to Archbishop Magee, and touched in a tone which speedily convinced that dignitary that the spiritual tournament he had intended to institute, when heading the proselytism movement then called the "New Light," was likely to expose the aggressor to the fatigues of real war. Dr. Doyle had then said,

"It must have been a painful avowal to your grace, the acknowledgment that in this country, so famed for its love of justice, 'there should be found many who deem it no violation of that cardinal virtue to infringe or evade the laws which are designed to protect the property of the Church.' The reason is, my lord, that in this country the nature of your Church property is understood by all, and is considered as different from every other in it. Your property is not held by deed nor conveyance, for it was transferred by law from those who held it by these titles. It is not held by prescription from time immemorial, for all know when and how you became possessed of it, what your title was, what the good faith by which you held it, and what the term of your possession. . . . You hold, my lord, by the law, and the law alone,—not by the Divine law, for that ceased, as regards tithes, with the Commonwealth of the Jews,—not by the law of the Church, for you have no connection whatever with the Church which once possessed them in this

country. You satisfy none of the obligations which she incurred on receiving them; you discharge none of the duties which her ministers were bound in justice to perform *for them and with them*. You possess your property only by virtue of the civil law, and that law is penal, and highly penal.”\*

The Catholic Church was, at the time of that letter, DISINHERITED. That later law, passed in 1851, by which it is PROSCRIBED also, had not then been passed; for such men as Dr. Doyle and Mr. O’Connell were still alive, and the famine prophesied by the Bishop had not as yet prostrated the people of Ireland, and reduced them to a state of weakness far exceeding that of 1823. Whether Dr. Doyle would have been contented with an additional “penal law” because it cannot be, or has not been as yet, enforced, and is only held in contumely over our heads by an enemy at once frightened and insolent; whether he would have deemed that a law, insulting and assailing, ceases to be hateful merely because it is contemptible also; whether he would have thought that a law, though not enforced, is really without a practical effect, when to the ascendant minority it imparts a more minatory superiority, while on the Church of the nation it brands the stigma, not of isolated illegal acts, but of a total existence against law,—all this, alas, is left to conjecture since no pamphlet on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill can be expected signed with those well-known initials, J. K. L., *James Kildare and Leighlin*. We return, therefore to what stands recorded, not doubting that the great prelate, whose nature, with all its gentleness, was

“Based on a surging subterranean fire,”

and to whom the cry of wrong was ever as the trumpet-blast summoning the strong man to battle, would, had his life been spared, have used language not less strong, on the occasion referred to, than that used by his friend, Archbishop Murray, when he wrote that he had trusted and been deceived, and that the men whom he had trusted were the men who had made a mockery of his gray hairs.

In every age it is convenient to traduce the faith in order to find a pretext for oppressing it. The following language, addressed to Lord Wellesley, is Dr. Doyle’s reply to such attempts:

“It was the creed, my lord, of a Charlemagne and of a St. Louis, of an Alfred and an Edward, of the monarchs of the feudal times as well as of the emperors of Greece and Rome; it was be-

\* Vol. i. p. 203.

lieved at Venice and in Genoa, in Lucca and the Helvetic nations, in the days of their freedom and greatness; all the barons of the middle ages, all the free cities of later times, professed the religion we now profess. You well know, my lord, that the charter of British freedom, and the common law of England, have their origin and source in Catholic times. Who framed the free constitutions of the Spanish Goths? Who preserved science and literature during the long night of the middle ages? Who imported literature from Constantinople, and opened for her an asylum at Rome, Florence, Padua, Paris, and Oxford? Who polished Europe by art, and refined her by legislation? Who discovered the New World, and opened a passage to another? Who were the masters of architecture, of painting, and of music? Who invented the compass, and the art of printing? Who were the poets, the historians, the jurists, the men of deep research and profound literature? Who have exalted human nature, and made man appear little less than the angels?—Were they not, almost exclusively, the professors of our creed? Were they who created and possessed freedom under every shape and form unfit for her enjoyment? ”\*

In 1824, Dr. Doyle replied to some strictures made by Mr. North. That eminent man boasted in parliament of what he considered the great services of the Kildare-Street Society in dispelling the “thick and palpable darkness” in which the Irish people had long grovelled, and substituting a wholesome teaching for the “immoral and seditious books generally used in the Catholic schools with the tacit sanction or connivance of the Catholic priesthood.” After showing that where books of a disedifying character had been introduced into the hedge-schools, it was by the Catholic clergy that they were removed, the Bishop pointed out, with a trenchant pen, by what laws, and to what men, the low condition of Irish education was occasioned, illustrating his statement with appeals to recent facts.† Much that Dr. Doyle wrote on such topics, however valuable for the time in which it was published, would have seemed superfluous some twelve years ago. It is at once sad and strange to observe how applicable these parts of his works have again become to the times in which we live, when to the learned and impartial writings of a Maitland have succeeded elaborate vindications of Henry VIII.; when calumnies against the Church as stupid and false as Fox’s *Book of Martyrs* are again provided for the appetite of the public; and when, in place of the ready concessions of a Hallam respecting the persecutions carried out by Protestant monarchs, whether with or without a political pretext, we are again

\* Vol. i. p. 269.

† Vol. i. pp. 313-315.



assured by men whose unhappy task is that of sustaining, let us hope unconsciously, the "false tradition" in history, that it was always for high treason, not for religion, that recusants were punished in Queen Elizabeth's reign,—that the Catholics were prompted only by romance to provide sliding panels for the concealment of their priests,—that the sufferings of the Irish were in part exaggerated, and in part self-provoked,—and that persecution was hardly ever practised against that religion which, from the day when Elizabeth struck down the Catholic hierarchy to the passing of Catholic Emancipation, had never ceased to be persecuted by law!

To the zeal of primitive times in defence of his flock, Dr. Doyle united the vigour of primitive times in ruling it. We have alluded to the solemn Pastorals with which he put down Ribbon conspiracies, while he also threw his whole weight into the constitutional efforts made for the redress of wrongs. Against other local abuses he was not less powerfully armed.

"On the occasion of his visit to Mountrath, in 1825, faction-fighting had prevailed to a frightful extent. Having ascertained the leaders to be men who had frequently been checked for similar tendencies, he summoned them before him. Hardened as they were in other respects, they trembled to disobey their Bishop, and proceeded to the chapel. The congregation knew that a storm was brewing. . . . After the Confirmation-Mass, Dr. Doyle (the wave of whose hand acted like the loadstone upon iron) motioned the ringleaders of the faction to advance within the altar-rails. They were colossal men, of iron nerve and almost savage countenance; but they obeyed the Bishop's summons with the alacrity of children, and knelt down humbly before him. Dr. Doyle uttered a touching exhortation; but this had several times been addressed to them, and he felt that something more was necessary to smother the growing abuse for ever. The candles were extinguished, and other preparations were made for the awful ceremony of excommunication. I was too frightened to remember more; but I knew that faction-fighting received its death-blow on this occasion. The leaders, having shown true repentance, were soon afterwards tenderly received back again by their Bishop."\*

In 1826, the proselytisers of that day, following in the steps of a famine then prevailing in his diocese (for Ireland's "difficulty" is always their "opportunity"), met with some success in their joint distribution of tracts and bread. At Staplestown, a few of the refuse of the parish began to "have doubts." Dr. Doyle heard, and went.

\* Vol. i. p. 389.

“‘Go,’ said he, ‘go to your new master. No one can serve two. . . . I excommunicate you!’ A long deep groan of wildness and despair swept through the chapel. Some fled panic-stricken : others fell prostrate before the altar, sobbing and imploring forgiveness of God, and of his faithful vicar. ‘Pardon them, my lord,’ interposed the parish-priest ; ‘they repent.’ ‘No,’ said Dr. Doyle, ‘the crime is too great to be immediately forgiven.’”\*

His tenderness for his flock was equal to his severity, as it was the cause of it. The following passage seems to carry us back to the age of St. Cyprian and the martyr-deacon, the St. Stephen of the West. In 1824 there was a famine at Carlow.

“It was by his own singular and personal efforts that 2000 persons were fed every day at the college, at the convent, and at the soup-kitchen. . . . ‘Poor Peter is ashamed of me,’ said the Bishop, ‘and has given me 25*l.* to keep the life in me (as he said) by warm clothing ; but the poor fellow has done more than he fancied, as I shall, of course, give it to the poor this day, and keep the life in hundreds of persons for many years to come. . . . I shall sell some silver tankards which I have received as presents. I shall dispose also of my gold watch, and I have already made arrangements to sell to the Bishop of — some chalices which we do not want.’ ‘Oh, my lord,’ said one of the party, ‘surely you do not mean to sell the chalices!’ ‘Be assured, friend,’ he answered, ‘I will sell them, and all I have in the world beside, in the present necessity. Surely, sir, you would not have me to preserve the mere metal within which our Lord temporarily resides in His sacramental form, and let perish the living tabernacle, the faithful hearts of my own poor suffering people, where He and the Holy Ghost cherishingly dwell, as their dearly-loved habitation in this world of sin.’”†

The last sentence might perhaps suggest deep thoughts (better things than *bravura* phrases and declamatory brain-tricks) to those who persuade themselves that “sacerdotal claims” flourish at the expense of the “*Pauperes Christi*,” and that Catholicity slights the “INDIVIDUAL,” with all his awful prerogatives and trials, for the sake of the body at large.

The skill with which Dr. Doyle varied his method, both of thought and expression, according to the intellectual character of the person he addressed, was remarkable. The following extract from his *Essay on the Catholic Claims*, addressed to Lord Liverpool in 1826, is in singular contrast with the sharper but less philosophic tone in which he addressed Archbishop Magee. Writing to a statesman, he points out that the Church, though a universal and super-

\* Vol. i. p. 500.

† Vol. i. p. 310.



natural institute, not (like a state) a local one, has yet something in common with a state. This is the circumstance which the sects never see. In habitual servitude, they boast that they do not overstrain their authority; and, wholly without ecclesiastical government, they exult that they are never charged with governmental abuses, which is much as if an oyster were to be proud that he had never gout in his toes.

“From this sketch of our doctrinal and legal economy, if I may so style it, two things must be quite obvious to your lordship: first, that it would be as unreasonable to expect the same simplicity in our laws as might be found in those of a Church of one or two centuries, and confined to some one nation, as it would be to look for the same number of statutes in the new State of Columbia as are to be found in the code of Great Britain; and that it would be equally unwise, a similar proof of presumption and ignorance, for a man to charge the whole system of the British laws and constitution with inconsistency or absurdity, because their nature and meaning were unknown to him, as it would be to pronounce the creed and discipline of the Catholic Church monstrous because it happened not to be understood by him. The harmony, the beauty, the excellence of the constitution and laws of England are always appreciated and prized in proportion as they are known and understood, whilst their antiquity contributes to render them venerable and secure: so, my lord, the order, the harmony, the consistency of our doctrine, and of our ecclesiastical government, have been, for similar reasons, approved and appreciated at all times by the wise and learned of all sects and countries. To these qualities, so eminently conspicuous in our Church, her continuance and preservation, amidst the wreck of states and nations, have been attributed by the most learned of her adversaries, whilst *we* assign them to that all-ruling Providence which, in virtue of the Redeemer's promise, watches over her with a peculiar and unceasing care. The second thing which appears from what I have noticed is, that if any one wishes to learn our doctrine and discipline, the laws and usages which prevail universally amongst us, or those which are confined to any one nation or province, he must have recourse for such information to the authentic records of our faith, and to the code of our existing laws; and should he be unable to satisfy himself by the inspection or perusal of these, he must, as in all analogous cases, apply to men who by their profession and station in the Church are competent, and even obliged, to furnish it.”\*

Mr. Fitz-Patrick tells us that Dr. Doyle knew Blackstone nearly by heart.

“Dr. Doyle was a prelate of an entirely new type,” remarks Mr. Fitz-Patrick; “fear, doubt, or diffidence were unknown to him. With

\* Vol. i. p. 461.



one glance he could make the wielder of an insult wither. 'His face,' says a celebrated and acute observer (Mr. Sheil), 'has a very peculiar expression; intelligence throughout, strength, and an honest scorn about the mouth and lips. . . . The remark may be fanciful, but it struck me that I could discover in his controlled and measured gait the same secret consciousness of strength, and the same reluctance to display it.' 'I never,' said Canon Pope, 'knew a man whose demeanour inspired a stronger or wider feeling of awe and veneration. I have met all the Cardinals and Princes of the Church, at Rome and elsewhere, but not one of them ever impressed me with that singularly intense feeling of respect and admiration which Dr. Doyle's presence never failed to enkindle.'"<sup>\*</sup>

Our quotations have been restricted to the first volume of Mr. Fitz-Patrick's excellent work. For the present we must leave a subject which would exhaust a space far greater than we can afford on this occasion.

---

## REASON AND FAITH.

IN a paper on Reason and Faith in our last Number, we treated rather of the relations of the religious or faithful mind with the scientific mind, than the relations between the truths that Christians believe and the truths which science seeks to know. We considered the contest between science and faith in their characters of qualities of mind and principles of action; now we have to look at the relations between the objects and results of science and the things proposed to our belief,—between the accumulations of science and the records of faith, the creeds, the Church, and the Scripture.

The creeds are summaries of Christian faith, comprising not all that is revealed, not all that should be known, but all that need be known by the adult of average intellect as the condition of his joining the Church, and as the indispensable foundation of his Christian life. There can be no question of a contest between the articles of the creed and science, because it is confessed both by philosophers and divines that natural science and the dogmas of faith stand on different platforms, and have nothing to do with each other. "The articles of faith," says St. Thomas,<sup>†</sup> "cannot be proved demonstratively, because faith is of things which appear not. . . . This must be minded, for fear that under pretence of demon-

<sup>\*</sup> Vol. i. p. 494.

<sup>†</sup> Sum. i. 9, 46, art. 2.

strating the faith, we should employ only probable arguments, and so give unbelievers ground for mocking us when they think that our faith rests on such insufficient grounds." Thus "he who attempts to prove the dogma of the Trinity by natural reasons injures the faith both in its dignity, for it has to do with invisible things which transcend our reason; and in its interests, for he destroys the chance of the conversion of those who laugh at the flimsiness of the base on which they suppose our faith is founded. We must always rest our proofs upon authorities which our opponents admit; and in default, we must be contented with showing that the facts which faith affirms are not impossible."\* The distinction is clearly drawn; reason cannot go farther than to show that the dogmas are not impossible, not self-contradictory, not inconsistent with the fundamental data of reason, or with other orders of known truth. It requires the authority of revelation to prove that they are true. "*Abscondita Deo nostro: mundum tradidit disputationi hominum.*" The invisible world is God's; we know no more of it than He reveals. The visible world is handed over to the investigation of men.

A detailed review of the contents of the creeds and definitions would show that their subject matter is all outside the sphere of phenomena, which is the realm of science. The Trinity, the Incarnation, the Fall and the Redemption, Grace, the Sacraments, the authority of the Church, the inspiration of Scripture, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, heaven and hell, offer no hold for scientific experiments. The philosopher may theorise upon them in a way that offends faith; but it will be only theory, not science. He will have once more proved the venerable truism, that without revelation we have no demonstration of any Christian doctrine, that each dogma becomes a mere guess, and therefore as susceptible of denial as of affirmation.

But, it may be said, "The creed talks of the world, which is handed over to men's disputes, of physiology in the virgin conception and birth and the death and resurrection of our Lord, touches on history in the date *sub Pontio Pilato*, and adds no man knows what to the heap of credenda by introducing the Church, which may teach what it likes, and the Scripture, which does teach many things at variance with modern discoveries, and which it takes care we should not interpret in conformity with these discoveries by binding us down to the exploded interpretations of the Fathers. Is not this a contest between faith and science?"

\* Sum. i. 9, 32, 1.



The most extended notice of the world in any creed is in that of the fourth Council of Lateran. The faith teaches that the world is not eternal, but was created out of nothing, not of necessity but freely, by God, "the one sole Creator of all things visible and invisible, spiritual and corporeal; who by His almighty power at once in the beginning of time formed out of nothing the two systems of matter and spirit, the world and the angels; and then made man as a mean between the two, composed of spirit and body." Not one of these points is capable of scientific proof or refutation. The creation of the material and spiritual worlds is an article of faith; not so the time or manner of their creation, in which questions we may take any side, or adopt any theory about the progressive or sudden formation of the universe, the celestial mechanism, the world's chronology, or the meaning of the "days" of Genesis. These questions do not enter into the faith as summed up in the creeds, and, so far, are still left to the disputes of men.

The physiological facts in the creed are there, not because they are natural, but because they are miraculous; now all that science can do, is to prove that they are not natural; but this was known before. Again, from the presence of one small fact of civil history in the creed, it does not follow that faith interferes with general historical investigations, or with the philosophy of history. The name of Pontius Pilate is immaterial to the act of faith, and if it was essential, his existence is a fact beyond a doubt; the most sceptical would be ashamed to call it in question if it were not for the object of insulting Christianity.

The objections concerning the Church and Scripture are weightier. The creed binds us to accept Scripture, with all its statements about nature and man, such as science has a right to dispute upon. And though Protestants may pass over them on pretence of their unascertained and unascertainable meaning, the Catholic cannot do so, as he is bound to the sense imposed by the Church and her doctors. He professes that he "admits the holy Scripture in that sense which is held and has been held by our holy mother the Church, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures," and that he never "will receive or interpret them except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." But, for example, cannot Church and Fathers be cited in support of a cosmogony which, however well grounded in Scripture and tradition, is quite disproved by modern discoveries? Are we bound to such a theory? And has not the Church condemned as false and



unscriptural the theory of the mechanism of the universe, which is now a demonstrated truth? Are we bound by such a condemnation?

Here is the focus of the difficulty. The articles of the faith are not in contradiction with science; but they come to us so involved in Scripture and the tradition of the Church, that any material error in these *media* would invalidate the authority on which we accept the faith, and would thus involve it in uncertainty, and render real faith impossible. Hence the relations of Church and Scripture with science involve the very existence of Christianity. The Church enters into these relations in two characters; first, as teacher of the Catholic faith, or creeds; secondly, as guardian and mother of the theological habit of faith.

The Catholic faith is the body of doctrine proposed to all the faithful as necessary to be believed in order to salvation. It consists of articles of faith, laws of morals, and certain dogmatic facts in which some of the doctrines are enveloped. The revealed dogmas are outside the sphere of science, and afford no ground for a collision between science and faith. The dogmatic facts are either miraculous, and so beyond the realm of science, as the article, "born of the Virgin Mary;" or such individual events as the commonest testimony is sufficient to prove, as the article, "crucified and buried." But it is to be noted that these external facts are not in themselves the objects of faith, but only so far as they are the outward expressions of an inward truth. "Of the phenomenon," says Suarez,\* "there is not faith, but experience; it is not revealed, but seen; it is not proposed as the object of faith, but to lead to faith. The inner truth and substance is something distinct from the outward seeming, and faith has to do with the substance, not with the shape." St. Thomas puts his finger into his Master's side, and makes his act of faith, not in what he sees, but in what he infers. He saw the living flesh that had been dead; he believed in the incarnate God.

The Catholic faith, then, being limited to the invisible substance, and the few individual facts in which this substance was manifested, it is clear that the authority of the Teacher of this faith is by the force of the term comprised within the same limits; the Church, as the infallible teacher of religion, only claims infallible authority in questions wholly and directly religious, and in the religious element of mixed questions.

But whatever limits there are to the Catholic faith, we

\* De Fid. disp. 2, § ix.

can put none to God's revelation. God might reveal an answer to any question that man's curiosity could put. Are there men in the moon, or in Jupiter? And it is a fact that in the revealed Word there is much which is directly within the provinces of the historian and philosopher, and which is delivered over to the disputation of men. And yet if men conclude against it, they throw a slur upon Scripture, cast a doubt on the authority of the records of faith, and so make faith impossible. We are in a dilemma. If the Church is the infallible teacher of faith, she should have power to interpret in her own way the texts which, otherwise interpreted, contradict her infallible teaching by making the Scripture false which she teaches to be true. And yet she has no power over the facts to which those texts refer. It becomes, therefore, an anxious duty for the Catholic to determine the precise relation of the Church to those parts of revelation which do not directly refer to religion. (1) Has she infallible authority to interpret them? or (2) has she only a limited right of practical interference in controversies about them? or (3) has she no right to speak on Scriptural questions that do not directly belong to faith, morals, or discipline? The affirmation of the first question allows faith to crush science; of the second, leaves it undetermined whether or not science is contrary to faith; of the third, subordinates faith to science.

1. Has the Church an infallible authority over the interpretation of these texts? It belongs to her "to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture;" but in performing this function she does not, says Möhler, proceed by the rules of verbal criticism, nor by the interpretation of particular texts; indeed when she quotes a text to prove a doctrine, we are bound to believe the doctrine, but not bound to believe that the text proves it. But if she be an infallible guide, then no doctrine which she rejects can be contained in Scripture: hence, though she cannot search the Scripture to *discover* what to teach (because she knew what to teach before the New Testament was written, and therefore she cannot accept Scripture as the original well-spring of her doctrine), yet she may reprove the man who affirms that a text contains a doctrine which she rejects, or that a text which expresses in terms any of her doctrines *must* be interpreted metaphorically. For both propositions suppose that the Church contradicts Scripture by her doctrines. But she has no infallible key for texts not thus connected with her dogmas. "Her interpretation does not descend to the details which claim the attention of the scientific exegetist. It is *not her duty*, nor has



*she the right* to determine when, by whom, and why the book of Job was written. She does not explain particular words or verses, their bearings on each other, or the connection between the sections of a sacred book. Antiquities are not in her domain; her interpretation extends only to doctrines of faith and morals." "It is one thing," says St. Augustine, "not to know the primary meaning of the sacred writer, and another to err from the rule of faith." "The ancient consent of the Fathers," says Vincent of Lerins, "is not to be looked for in every little question that arises on the divine law, but only, or at any rate chiefly, in the rule of faith."

There are, however, those who claim for the Church an infallible authority over all things that "pertain to faith and morals, and to *the support of Christian doctrine*," but as the overthrow of any single text would overthrow the Christian doctrine concerning the Scriptures, therefore the vindication of every text pertains to the support of that doctrine, and therefore it belongs to the Church to interpret infallibly every sentence of the Bible.

A crucial test of the validity of this reasoning may perhaps be found in the prophetic passages of Scripture. As these passages are the proofs of the inspiration of her first teachers, it is of the last consequence to her that they should be true. But the Church cannot make them come true, unless she can dictate the course of events. God, in denying her this power, has reserved to Himself the office of fulfilling that which the prophets have foretold. And as she is unable to fulfil the prophecies, so is she unable to write history beforehand, and predict how they will be fulfilled. To interpret rightly a prophecy before its accomplishment is to choose out of many possible interpretations that which shall be the true one. This is a prophetic gift, requiring a prophetic inspiration, and certainly is not among the ordinary gifts or graces bestowed on the Church.

And even if the Church had this prophetic gift, it would not prove that she could interpret all her prophecies. The inspired prophets and apostles did not always know the meaning of the predictions they were commissioned to pronounce. For there is an inspiration which impels a man to announce something which he understands imperfectly, or not at all. We have instances of such inspiration in Caiphas, and in those who had the gift of tongues or prophecy without the gift of interpretation. The Apostles themselves misunderstood our Lord, as when He said that St. John should tarry till He came, or when they and the whole Church lived in daily expectation of the second advent. Indeed, with respect

to one prediction, that of the restoration of Israel, our Lord plainly told them, "It is not for you to know the times and moments which the Father hath put in His own power." If it was not for the Apostles to know these particulars, neither was it for the Church. Another instance. In Job xxxviii. and xxxix. the creation of the world is described in a series of questions which the patriarch is challenged to answer: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" and so on, till Job is constrained to own that he knows nothing but his own ignorance. "I have spoken unwisely, and things *that above measure exceeded my knowledge.*" That which exceeds the knowledge of the prophet and the apostle, exceeds the knowledge of the Church, which is built upon them, and knows no more than they communicated to her; but they could not communicate more than they had, and perhaps they did not communicate all they had. For as St. Augustine says, "even if they knew, their commission was to tell only what was profitable to salvation," therefore, he continues, they did not tell us what is the form of the heavens, because it does not signify to religion what form they have. On the whole, then, they probably did not know the meaning of all they were commissioned to utter; and even if they had known it all, it by no means follows that they should have communicated it all to the Church. And hence we may conclude that the Church has no authority to interpret the prophecies of Scripture, except so far as they involve faith or morals.

This conclusion, so far from being derogatory to the Church, seems to exhibit her as a spouse in her husband's arms, not every moment asking with fear and suspicion what he is going to do, but full of trust, confident that the perils she is being borne through, are more apparent than real, and will all be triumphantly surmounted. If she had been launched into the world, and left to her own resources, she might well have demanded a control over events; she might then well view all progress with suspicion, and fear lest discovery might at last discredit her claims, or politics destroy her independence. But she is a spouse, not a widow, and her Lord, who is with her all days, has reserved for Himself the task of avenging her honour, and of justifying her faithfulness. It is His business, not hers. She has only to teach that which she has the commission to teach with infallible authority. On questions of history, politics, science, interpretation of prophecy, and subjects outside the faith, which serve only to recommend her faithfulness or vindicate her character, she must resign herself to the jealous care of "her Maker and



her Husband," and her rulers must remember that he that is too anxious to "bear witness to himself," loses both dignity and credit.

When the Church, the teacher of the faith, tells us to interpret Scripture according to her teaching, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, she must be considered as giving us with one hand her tradition and dogmas, and with the other the Scriptures, bidding us expatiate at will in this ample field, so long as we do not directly or indirectly contradict the faith. "In things which do not pertain to faith or morals," says a great Canonist, "a man may affirm what he pleases, if the matter is indifferent." "To mistake," says St. Augustine, "in matters which make no difference to salvation, whether they are believed or not, whether they are thought true or false, is no sin." But the Church does not give us the Bible to seek therein new doctrines of faith. Her faith is her life; a new faith is a new life, and a new life implies a negation and condemnation of the former living. To preach a new faith is to proclaim that the Church was dead, till the preacher restored her to life, as her new founder and apostle. While we keep clear of this absurdity, in all the rest we have perfect freedom. Neither her authority nor that of the Fathers determines questions of chronology or natural history. "Except in the interpretation of a very few classical passages," says Möhler, "we know not where we shall meet with a general uniformity of Scriptural interpretation among the Fathers, further than that they deduce from the sacred writings the same doctrines, yet each in his own peculiar manner." The "unanimous consent of the Fathers" is only a phrase equivalent to "common ecclesiastical tradition," the faith in which all agree, excluding opinions on which they differ; and the authority belongs not to their reason or research, but to the tradition of which they were the channels. In matters not of faith or morals, however closely connected with Scriptural history, we are not bound by any decision of the Church, nor by any array of Patristic authority. "In matters of philosophy," says St. Thomas, "which do not relate to the faith, the decisions of the holy Fathers are of no more authority than those of the philosophers whom they follow." So much for the first question.

2. Has, then, the Church only a *limited right of practical interference* in controversies about those parts of revelation which do not directly affect religion? And when we say *practical* instead of *theoretical* interference, we consider the Church no longer as the teacher of dogma, but as the nurse of the habit of faith, the legislator and ruler of the faithful.

We have already considered her powers with regard to the dogmas ; it remains to speak of that authority in behoof of the moral habit of faith, which belongs to her in her character of guardian and governor of men in matters pertaining to the faith.

If the Church had not this limited right, the affirmative of the third question would be true, and she would be condemned to a perpetual silence on all questions not directly concerning faith, morals, or discipline ; and philosophers would have an unquestioned power of sapping the approaches and outworks of faith. But the Church cannot, and does not, admit this ; since she does interfere in such controversies without claiming infallible authority to determine them, she acts on, and therefore affirms, the general law that she has the right to interfere, even where her judgment is not infallible.

Such an interference, however expressed, cannot constitute a definition of faith. To call it so is to damage the Church's cause. If the Church had only a right to interfere where her judgment was infallible, she would have gone beyond her rights in half the books she has placed on the Index ; she would have shown herself ignorant of the limits of her authority, and would have proved by her acts that she did not know on what subjects she was infallible. And if this had been so, it would follow that all her decrees must be subject to the revision of a higher court, which would decide whether or no she had gone beyond the bounds of her infallible authority. Thus, even in her infallibility, she would be subject to a higher tribunal, which might set up a rival and contradictory infallibility.

All this difficulty vanishes when we think of the Church not simply as dogmatic teacher, but as guardian and nurse of the virtue or habit of faith. We have already pointed out the chief rivalries between the habit of faith and the habit of science : their interference as rival occupants of the attention ; their mutual depreciation of each other's ends ; the conservatism of the one, and the changeableness of the other. We cannot deny that the conservative dislike of change has been often manifested by the faithful with equal weakness and obstinacy. For we are a mixed multitude ; most of us are poor and ignorant ; and men, even when most refined and educated, are often full of prejudices. Out of this mixed multitude our leaders and spokesmen are chosen, and their sympathies, as well as their interests generally, lie with the many against the few. If our leaders were angels from heaven, they would be forced to take us as we are ; being only men,



they have often no higher ideal, but try also to keep us what we are. Their object is to help us to our supernatural end, and to keep us faithful to the teaching and discipline of the Church. They know the reality of what the Church aims at, and its unrivalled importance; they care for nothing else, and take no interest in our political or philosophical views, except when they react upon our faith and morals. They tolerate all that proves to be compatible with faith, and try to suppress all that they think detrimental to it; in doing so they inevitably interfere in controversies which they cannot infallibly settle. Natural science is not within the domain of faith, yet from the beginning faith has followed one rule in regard to it. Whenever natural science has been mixed up with heresy, or has been an occasion of unbelief, or has excited the passions and caused moral disturbances, faith has discouraged and opposed it. The first religious command was the prohibition of the tree of knowledge. Then came the laws against magic and the occult sciences; and if the modern magnetism and table-turning, in spite of their adepts identifying them with the old magic and witchcraft, are not formally condemned, it is because these new impostures are not necessarily connected with the idea of a compact with invisible powers, but pretend to go by natural laws. If they are only "natural magic," they are lawful till they endanger morals. Many other tenets connected with the science of nature were formerly disallowed, but are now tolerated. In the beginning of the controversy on original sin, "the very root of Pelagianism was, that Adam did not become mortal by the Fall, but was created so."\* Yet now every one holds that his immortality was not involved in his natural creation, but in his supernatural gift. To deny that the earth was a flat disk was reckoned heretical by St. Augustine; and St. Boniface and Pope Zacharias obliged St. Vigilius to recant the scandalous assertion of antipodes, supposed to involve the existence of men for whom Christ had not died. St. Augustine, probably for the same reason, calls it heresy to assert the plurality of worlds, though St. Clement of Rome had taught it. Galileo was vehemently suspected of heresy for his adherence to Copernicus. Aristotle's works were forbidden by the Councils of Tours (1163) and of Paris (1209). After the Germans and Celts had been converted from their nature-worship, intimate intercourse with nature became suspected of witchcraft, and the sinful reading of works on physical science was forbidden. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and almost all the older Fathers, objected to the

\* J. B. Morris, *Jesus, Son of Mary*, vol. i. p. 77.

plastic arts as handmaids of idolatry. These are examples of opinions and practices, indifferent in themselves, being reckoned heretical because of their accidental accompaniments. For when a truth of any order first strikes the imagination of a people, its effects are disorderly. One party considers it a dangerous innovation, the other exalts it above all hitherto known, and dates a new era from its discovery. Even truths which were destined to be afterwards admitted into the closest fellowship with Christian doctrine, on their first rise formed the basis of heretical opinions; Dr. Newman cites the examples of Montanism, Gnosticism, and Sabellianism.\* Error is only the perversion of truth. Truths suddenly thrust upon ill-regulated or empty minds assume an exaggerated importance which blinds the intellect to all other truths, and so they become heresies. Even religious truth may be prematurely known, and its exaggerated and dislocated assertion may result in a lie. It is often the same with the religious effects of the sudden effulgence of a new physical truth. Hence the considerate master teaches with economy. "I have yet many things to say to you," said our Lord to the Apostles, "but ye cannot bear them now." A new principle of philosophy working on the ardent brains of young students generally begets a school which denies all principles but the new one. The Benthamites made utility and pleasure not only the corner-stones of their system, but its only stones. The revival of physiognomy begets phrenology, claiming to be all philosophy. The revival of the medical principle *similia similibus*, true in many cases, begets homœopathy, which affirms its exclusive truth. Most modern systems are chargeable with the quackery of extending a partial truth into all spheres of science. Now, all the ecclesiastical interferences with science are easily defensible so far as they are directed against this false application of scientific truths. Whenever the bent of philosophers or the prejudices of the faithful impress upon a new or revived theory, however true, the tendency to upset faith, the Church may proscribe the theory, and brand it as scandalous, rash, absurd, false, or heretical, without pretending to decide on its absolute truth or falsehood in its own sphere. It is called false if it seems to prove the true faith to be a lie, even although it owes its evil force only to the prejudices and ignorance of the faithful; it is called heretical if it is used to strengthen and illustrate the arguments of heretics; it is called absurd if, while only an uncertain hypothesis, it is used to undermine the certainty of faith.

\* Essay on Development, p. 349.



The government of the Church may be considered in several aspects: in one it is the organ of the Holy Spirit, guarding the deposit of faith, teaching faith and morals with infallible precision, and claiming interior assent to its decisions. In another aspect the government of the Church is the organ of the multitude of Christians, reflecting faithfully their prejudices and fears, and repressing what they for the moment feel to be dangerous to their convictions or principles. For the rulers of the Church are personally only her children, though they are the leaders, the examples, and the flowers of the flock,—often sharing its prejudices, still more often loth to offend the prejudices which they do not share. In this aspect the Church nurses her children, as a mother presides in her nursery, lowering her intellect to the level of her babes, at the risk of gaining the contempt of her children who have outgrown the need of such condescension. When she feels too weak to receive new truths without scandalising masses of her children, she will prohibit them, at the risk of scandalising the few philosophers who may yet know them.

But such prohibitions make no claim to interior assent, as prohibitions of propositions against the faith do. Orthodox faith is necessary to every Christian. The prevention of scandal by the suppression of irritating controversies only requires a silent acquiescence. Hence we need not be surprised at Cardinal Bellarmine's certificate to Galileo, testifying that he had not retracted one of his opinions after the first condemnation of the Copernican theory. Nor need we wonder that the Church should compromise matters by allowing the condemned theory still to be taught as a mere hypothesis; as the organ of popular feeling, and the judge of those who give scandal, she is obliged to protect those who cry out that the faith is in danger. The philosophers themselves would do the same, if they were placed in a similar position; if a revolution were to make them rulers of a country, they would prohibit all writings against their government which they thought capable of disturbing public opinion. Whatever measures philosophic politicians would take for the salvation of society, they must allow the rulers of the Church to take for the salvation of souls; if life is to be sacrificed to save one soul, can science claim exemption? If Christians may be debarred from an indifferent pursuit when it becomes an occasion of sin, they may also be debarred from a certain course of study when it becomes dangerous to their own or their neighbour's salvation. And, in fact, ecclesiastical and civil governments have ever taken analogous measures to defend themselves from the dangers

which they apprehended from certain opinions, political, social, or religious. It is only when civilisation has differentiated society to such a vast extent that the inquiry into the endless modifications of opinions would be impossible, that the axiom has emerged, that it is better for government to let opinions take care of themselves, and to leave them to be dealt with by social agencies, to be merged in an average balance of forces, where society is large enough to admit of averages. We are persuaded that the ecclesiastical tendency is in the same direction; and ecclesiastical authorities would now find it difficult to interfere with matters foreign to faith, as they interfered in the 17th century.

It is not easy to apologise for those whose prejudices and weakness make such interventions necessary. Ordinary Christians seem to forget that philosophers and politicians are also men, with souls to be saved, and with minds liable to be scandalised, indeed beset with doubts and difficulties of which the ignorant and thoughtless never dream. Why is it forgotten that if charity sometimes requires the philosopher to suppress a truth of whose scientific value and fecundity he has a clear view, for fear of scandalising good souls, good souls also are bound, both in charity and in justice, to remove all obstacles from the philosopher's path as soon as possible? Ignorance is not prejudice; prejudice arises from half knowledge or false knowledge, which is usually acquired with as much labour as true knowledge. It saves neither time nor trouble to teach doubtful or false cosmogony, or history, or chronology, as part of a theological course; it is slovenly logic to argue that because Suarez, Petavius, or à Lapidè were good divines, they were also competent authorities on physical science. If students in theology are forced to suck in the theories which ages of ignorance have foisted on Moses, when they have to work as clergymen they will experience in their own persons the way in which Church and Scripture have been exposed to the contempt of intelligent infidels, who, after hearing divines teaching physical falsehoods as Bible truths, have mocked at the same men when they claimed credence for biblical faith and morals; for most people have at least biblical knowledge enough to be aware that those who are found unfaithful in what men can see, are not to be believed when they speak of heavenly things that men cannot see.

Again, as this is not a matter in which the infallible teaching Church comes into action, but only the Church in her human and social character as the nursing-mother of faith, it is not disrespectful to remember, that here there is



greatest danger of the human weaknesses of the leaders of the Church cropping out, and overshadowing the divine character of the institution which they administer. There is danger in all cases of interference with secular science or progress on the ground of its supposed ill-effects upon faith, lest the interfering authorities should mistake their own irritation for a scandal growing up in the minds of the masses. There are pilots who take counsel only of their fears, exaggerate dangers, and create imaginary perils. It was in deference to the clamours, not of the ignorant laity, but of the instructed clergy, that the Congregation of the Index declared the Copernican system a false Pythagorean doctrine altogether adverse to Holy Scripture. The storm which these men dreaded was altogether of their own brewing, and the agitation was, for the most part, confined to their own minds; the illiterate classes, for whom they professed to fear, took no interest in either side of the controversy; far above their comprehension, the arguments of both parties passed by like the wind, and left no trace behind. The real object of fear, if the agitators would but have calmly examined their own consciences, was not the scandal of the simple, but the loss of their own personal authority; they suspected that the tenure of dogmatism in the field of induction was precarious, and they were angry with the new school which questioned its title; so without taking the precaution to sift the truth of facts, they pretended to judge of reality by convenience, boldly declared that to be true which they thought most conducive to their interest and their influence, and were reckless enough to attempt, not without an illusory show of success, to commit the Church to their views.

In intellectual encounters the Church and the world must always use the same weapons; they must argue upon the common principles of reason, and assume the same universally-accepted truths. In her battle with successive schools of philosophy, she has ever fought with their arms: they have passed away, and she remains; and the swords and bucklers she used are still hanging up in her museum. Happy if her children understood that the place where they hang was only a museum, not an arsenal! What engineer would trust to the picturesque walls of a mediæval castle to defend him against modern artillery? Yet some ecclesiastical engineers seem to do this; and their work reminds us of the vision of Hermas, who saw the Church like a beautiful tower, surrounded with unsightly heaps of rejected stones. The glorious creed of the Church is overshadowed with accretions which do not belong to it. False physiology, in-

herited from the dogmatists, disturbs moral theology. False astronomy and cosmology disfigure the popular interpretations of Scripture. To the man of science the high-road of Christian truth is blocked up with rubbish, the beautiful city is smothered with purlieus of mean houses, the impregnable rock is surrounded by lines of old fortifications built only against arrows and battering-rams. Though the real substance of the Church's truth is not affected, yet much of that brilliance has departed which dazzled the world when she first appeared, unencumbered with the superfluous spoils which have been accumulating for eighteen centuries. Each of her rusty suits of armour, each ruined outwork, was proper for the time when it was made; each protected the Church from some attack of the philosophy of the day by means of that philosophy. But for this very reason they are now crumbled into dust. They were not mere negations of the systems they opposed, but adaptations of them, founded on the admission of the truths on which they claimed to be built. And so whenever philosophy has denied its former self, and has removed to new ground, it has rendered the counter-works of religion useless, and has undermined them simply by withdrawing itself, leaving only ruins more or less picturesque or noble, but useless for present habitation or defence. The learning of the world, invited to dwell in them, answers by keeping outside the pale of Christianity.

There was not always reason to lament that the Christian ranks were so denuded, or so suspicious of great men that there was no one strong or influential enough to keep them up to the age, or to prevent them marching out in the armour of a crusader against the artillery of Armstrong and Whitworth. Of old the great schoolmen were the foremost men of their age; and no sooner did Aristotle threaten as fierce an opposition to the juridical theology of the Western Church as Kant or Mill threaten to its Aristotelised philosophy, than a St. Thomas was found to grapple with the rising heresy, to convert it, and to make it a buttress of the Church. Is there no truth in the modern systems that they are all to be treated so differently, that they are all suspected, and their friends treated as aliens from the Christian schools, and only Christians at all by a happy accident? The supernatural system of Christianity must be able to live at peace with any system of natural philosophy, true or false, which does not intrude into the supernatural realms that lie outside its sphere. Why should one such system only be favoured and the rest barely tolerated; especially when that system favours the intrusion of dogmatism into the field of induc-



tion, and is committed to astronomical and cosmogonical theories which modern science has demonstrated to be false? Why should Christians hug their chains, and even try to fasten them on the Church, instead of seeking to drop the log, and so to leave their limbs free for the intellectual contest to which they are challenged?

If the Aristotelic Christian schools have interfered with natural philosophy, natural philosophers have abundantly indemnified themselves by interfering with Christian science. Indeed, we fancy that philosophers first forced the Church to accept their systems, for which the successors of those philosophers laugh her to scorn. The earliest teachers of Christianity declared that such systems were outside the province of the Church. "It does not seem necessary to happiness," said St. Augustine, "to know the causes of the motions of the stars, which lie hid in the most secret recesses of nature. . . . If it were necessary to know the causes of material motion, none would have greater claims than the causes of health. But if our ignorance of these obliges us to go to the physicians, who does not see that we must bear with patience our ignorance of the secrets of heaven and earth?" Again: "We do not read in the Gospel that our Lord said, I send you the Paraclete to teach you the course of the sun and moon; for He wished to make us Christians, not astronomers." But this abstention of Christians did not satisfy the philosophers; they insisted upon hearing what the Christian schools had to say to their systems, and the fathers were reluctantly compelled, under protest, to speak their language. "The philosophers," says St. Ambrose, "wish us to own that the sphere of the heaven revolves rapidly, with all its brilliant stars, while the earth remains unmoved. . . . Now even granting what they ask, I may answer according to their own opinions," and so on; showing that St. Ambrose received the current astronomy, not as scriptural and Christian, but as that of the philosophers, on whom he throws the whole responsibility of it. In process of time, this astronomy had been so long taught in the Christian schools that its origin was forgotten, and it was supposed to be part of the tradition of the Church, instead of being a theory imposed upon her schools by the philosophers of the fifth century; and when the Copernican theory superseded it, both philosophers and divines, especially the latter, considered that the Church, and not the old astronomy, was the subject of attack. Galileo, indeed, thought that the new system was the more scriptural; and he demanded that the old system, forced upon the schools by his philosophical

predecessors of the fifth century, should be summarily evicted, and replaced by his new system. Bellarmine told him, that when the new theory was demonstrated it would be time enough to change the interpretation of Scripture. But the philosopher, we are told, "demanded that the Pope and Holy Office should declare it to be founded on the Bible, and wrote memorials on memorials."

We may conclude, then, upon the whole, that the infallible Church, the teacher of the faith, cannot be opposed to the march of science; because the faith is conversant solely with things about the reality of which science has not a word to say with any certainty. When science pretends to decide upon their truth, it goes beyond its limits, and ceases to be science; and the Church, in opposing this abuse, does not oppose science. But the Church has a more familiar and social aspect as guardian and nurse of the habit of faith; in this relation she has, like all other societies, a right of discouraging or repressing particular scientific theories *pro tempore* as long as she finds them dangerous to faith, and till they can be promulgated without mischief. The philosophers, however, will have reason to complain if she does not take strong and immediate measures for destroying those prejudices which impose upon her the lamentable and invidious necessity of interrupting, though only for a few years, the march of progress, and the discovery of the laws of nature.

Hence, in case of such a condemnation as that of Galileo for asserting the Copernican theory, the first thing to inquire is, whether the opinion is branded by the Church the teacher of the dogmas of faith, or by the Church the nurse of the habit of faith. Now the only organs of the Church, as infallible teacher of dogmas, are (1) the consentient teaching of all pastors in communion with the Pope, (2) a general council approved and confirmed by the Pope, and (3), according to the most approved school, the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*, and declaring that he is defining *de fide*: though, as long as persons are permitted to controvert the infallible authority of this last mode of ecclesiastical definition without ceasing to be Catholics, it cannot be put upon the same level as the two former modes. And none of these organs of ecclesiastical expression can delegate their infallible authority to any other institution or congregation; otherwise such organs might be indefinitely multiplied; nothing is *de fide* that is not defined by one or other of these three. And till such a definition can be produced, the condemnation of any scientific theory which has turned out to be true can



never fairly be used as a premiss to demonstrate the fallibility of the Church in teaching Christian doctrine.

But nothing can prevent men from bringing it forward as a proof of the jealousy that subsists in practice between the Church and science; and they will proceed to ask, "Is it not scandalous to allow Congregations like those of the Index and Holy Office to come forth with all the pomp of authority, and to condemn as false and heretical theories which the Church, as teacher of truth, has never so condemned?—as if the only object were to impose upon weak minds, and to force them to obedience by pretending an infallible authority which really has nothing to do with the matter in hand."

We need not be very careful to answer this objection; the Church as nurse of faith is only a generalisation of the social action of the Christian community; unquestionably, the whole Christian community may sometimes act in a scandalous manner, and compel its organs to do unjustifiable things. But the social action of the Church, being necessarily local, provincial, and national, can seldom be uniform. There is one Christian opinion in Italy, another in France, another in England. We cannot therefore argue from the intolerance, or impotence, or prejudice of one or more Christian provinces that the universal Church, if it acted together, would display the same weakness. Moreover it must be considered that besides the dogmas of faith, there exists in the Christian body a sentiment, an intelligence, that imbibes and assimilates the received beliefs and theories of the age, when these beliefs are not incompatible with faith. Christian knowledge thus embraces other things beside theology, and Christian philosophy is the organic whole of which theology is the head and the heart. This organic whole forms the basis of Christian education, and thus Christian faith becomes interwoven with, and partly dependent upon, many beliefs that are not of Christian origin. Thus in Galileo's day the physical philosophy of the peripatetics was incorporated with theology, and from this union there resulted a system partly true, partly false, which, as the ground of education, and the received mould and groove of Christian thought, could not be suddenly broken up without causing great distress and scandal, especially in a period of great religious disturbance. Interference with the philosopher who by means of a theory as yet undemonstrated was attempting to break up the received system was clearly not grounded on the truth or falsehood of his theory, but only on the scandal and harm he might cause,

or was supposed to have caused, in the Christian body. The guardians of the faith felt it to be their duty to guard the philosophy with which the faith was blended, to denounce those who attacked it, and to condemn their new opinions as contrary to philosophy and to faith. But at the same time, as if to take away all pretext for affirming that the condemnation was meant for a definition of faith, Bellarmine was commissioned to give Galileo a certificate of the falsehood of the calumnious report of his abjuration of any one of his doctrines or opinions. Now if the cardinals of the Congregation had really meant that the doctrine of the earth's motion was essentially contrary to Scripture and heretical, would they have permitted themselves to call the imputation of Galileo's having retracted it a "calumny"? These cardinals, then, never wished to "impose upon weak minds" with the pretence of authority, though less scrupulous ecclesiastics may have afterwards misused the sentence.

Now, though this is doubtless very galling to the philosopher, yet it is difficult to see how the divine can act on other principles. The very notion of social life is, that each individual gives up his wishes in some things in which he might please himself if he were living in a hermitage. Society is a compromise; and society cannot avail itself of the immense advantages of the social action of the Church without enduring some of the corresponding drawbacks. If society wants the Church to keep the uneducated masses quiet and virtuous through the influence of the faith, society must agree not to mar her work by offending the faith of these masses. And there is no great hardship here; the law of neighbourhood and nuisance applies to mind as well as body. I have no right to build either a factory or a school of opinion that shall be a source of danger and of grave annoyance to all my neighbours; for the stewardship of ideas is as much a trust as the stewardship of wealth. In neither has a man the unlimited right of doing what he will with his own.

We conclude, then, that in spite of occasional practical difficulties in the relations between bodies of Christians and philosophers, there never was and never can be any real opposition between scientific truth and the dogmas of faith taught by the infallible Church. The instances most relied on by objectors are only examples of the temporary social opposition of the Church to the tumultuous discussion of opinions that were at the time both undemonstrated and dangerous. She has never been opposed to their quiet investigation and demonstration; but she has opposed the



dishonest use sometimes made of them, when philosophers have pretended to submit them to the judgment of the ignorant mob, in order to gather a party, or to add fresh fuel to a movement already dangerous. Unlimited publicity is often only an appeal to popular prejudice. But in fact philosophers do not reckon the people to be the judges of their theories, and when they appeal to them it is generally for some unexpressed purpose that has nothing to do with science. If the Church suspects that this unexpressed purpose is opposition to herself, she may condemn the act without thereby meddling with the science.

Yet, after all, no Catholic can with honesty deny that the opposition of Christian society to the progress of thought has been carried on in a manner which has alienated much of the intelligence of Christian lands from the Church and from Christianity. The remedy, however, seems easy. If the Christian schools would escape from the consequences of their old-fashioned fidelity to philosophical systems which have no longer their old power in the world of thought, they must cultivate modern versatility, and not only leave to others, but assert for themselves, that freedom in doubtful matters which is quite compatible with unity in fundamental principles. Again, if their one-sidedness has led them into many a contest with the secular schools, they have only to acknowledge the many-sidedness of truth ; they have only to own that there is some truth in almost all human systems, and that no human system monopolises all truth even in its own order ; and therefore that no one such system should monopolise the favour of the Church, or occupy the Christian schools to the exclusion or depreciation of other systems.

Assuredly the remedy for the present intellectual eclipse of Catholic society is not to be found in assimilating the ecclesiastical government to the civil system, which is making such progress in Europe and America. The tendency of the principles of 1789 is to a democratic despotism, that is, to an absolute power, wielded in favour, not of privileged classes, but of the masses ; the average level of society is the ideal which it strives to uphold. Such a system is possible in temporal matters, which are disposed of more or less by force ; for the masses are the sphere of force, and if they can only be organised by a scientific administration, their power is irresistible. But the system fails when it comes to be applied to the world of ideas. Organisms whose forces are intellectual and moral cannot be ruled for the exclusive benefit of the existing average of intelligence, but they must always be

directed towards an ideal, which is much more nearly realised by the intellectual and moral few than by the average many. In such organisms, then, there must always be privileged classes, for there is no possible means of reducing all minds and hearts to the same level. To govern such a society on the levelling principle, on the principle of compelling all men to think in a uniform groove, to adopt the same political principles, the same theories of science, the same canons of taste, and to treat those who refuse the yoke as disloyal, disaffected, and treasonable subjects, necessarily alienates many intellectual persons, and forms them into a class apart, more or less hostile to the Christian society, continually reacting on the less intelligent classes, and, by spreading knowledge and education amongst them, continually winning them from the supremacy of those leaders whose yoke they have themselves cast off,—or, as they term it, emancipating them from ecclesiastical or clerical bondage. With such a system, the spread of education and the progress of knowledge would be a continual drain and loss to the Church ; whereas, if she extended her patronage and recognition equally to all truth, wherever found, the progress of knowledge would only enlarge her domain and increase her influence, instead of necessitating the cold withdrawal of all ecclesiastical patronage from every attempt to break through the charmed circle of custom, or to strike out a new path not already traced on the map, or to give an onward motion to the treadmill of ideas.

---

### **Communicated Articles.**

#### **ENGLISH PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN CATHOLIC TIMES.**

A QUESTION has arisen out of the recent educational controversy, which, as it is almost entirely of an antiquarian character, admits of being discussed without violation of the rule which has been made to insert no more letters in this Magazine on the subject of the controversy itself. The question is briefly this : Is the present practice of the English public schools as to discipline and the formation of character, or is that which is adopted in Catholic colleges, the truer counterpart of the system which prevailed in England before the Reformation ?



For the sake of clearness, it is necessary to begin by stating the assumed view of the things to be compared. By the Catholic method, whether abroad or at home, so far as it partakes of a common character, is to be understood, for the present purpose, one under which discipline is maintained by incessant personal supervision. It is not a question of intercourse, merely, between masters and students; because such intercourse has often been carried out, on principle, in Protestant schools and colleges. The late Dr. Arnold was ever most anxious that his boys should regard him less as their master than as their friend. At the universities (certainly at Oxford), tutors and pupils have often been thrown together in the relations of the most intimate confidence. Yet in both cases, and especially in the former, which is most in point, the motive of this intercourse, on the part of the superior, was solely and simply the moral and religious good of the pupil. So far as *this* kind of personal intercourse exists in the Catholic colleges, whether of England or of the Continent, it is not a point of characteristic difference from the modern public-school system of England. Mr. Allies, in his account of Catholic France, speaks more than once of such intercourse as existing between the superiors and students at St. Sulpice and elsewhere. But *this* is not what is meant by "surveillance." Let any one read, for instance, St. Alphonsus Liguori on Seminaries, and he will rise from the perusal of that treatise with an idea of "surveillance" as different as possible from that just described. What St. Alphonsus supposes is strictly a system of "police," into which *espionage*, in the fullest sense of the term, enters as a recognised institution, the conduct of which is intrusted to a special officer,—an "esploratore," as he is called, or "speculator,"—whose duty it is to be habitually on the look-out in the interests of discipline, though secretly from the students. Between this system and that of our English public schools, the opposition is less complete even in machinery than it is in spirit. It is not, as has been more than once said of late, that the importance of "discipline" is undervalued in our public schools, or that the enforcement of it is not a main object with those who administer public-school education. Nor is it true that the principle of governing the great body of the students through certain of their number, who are especially in the master's confidence, is a feature of moral education altogether unknown among Protestants, for this, as we have been always told, was a main cause of Dr. Arnold's success at Rugby. The difference turns chiefly upon the mode in which the influence is gained, and upon the nature of the

influence itself. For the master to have his spies among the boys unknown to the boys themselves; to encourage the practice of tale-telling; to be even expected to listen to such information with avidity; to adopt underhand and unrecognised methods of getting at his knowledge of what is going on;—these, and similar modes of government, which are popularly supposed to be the effects of what has been called the continental system, are undoubtedly opposed, *toto cælo*, to the ideas of education which prevail among English Protestants.

Has there not been a good deal of exaggeration on both sides of the late discussion? In the Catholic theory of education, even under its greatest disadvantages, there is this inestimable value in comparison with all Protestant methods, as such, that it makes the *soul* of the educated party its first and great object. It may err to any extent as to means; but its motive and end admit of no dispute. It *aims* at training Christians for the next world, and not for this. I am far from denying (indeed I have just asserted) that there have been Protestant masters of public schools, and Protestant tutors of colleges, who have recognised the same end, according to their light, as the paramount object of all education, and that too in practice as well as theory. But to speak of the sanctification of the student as the *finis ultimus* of English public-school education, is surely a mere delusion. The general spirit of the institution, as distinguished from the accidents of time, place, or person, is in a wholly different direction. Manliness, gentlemanliness, “spirit,” self-possession, tact, the sense of honour, and such-like qualities,—some of them valuable indeed in their way, but all of them perfectly compatible with the absence of any supernatural principle, and some of them even unchristian, at least in tendency,—these it is which constitute the heroic virtues of Protestant public schools.

Yet surely, on the other hand, to depreciate many of these qualities in their proper place, and to deny that, although parts of mere natural morality, some of them are yet not only compatible with grace but capable of a high religious application, is as extreme an assertion the other way; and one does not see how less than this can be understood in the wholesale condemnation of our public schools as the “most detestable of educational establishments.” The most perfect system of education, whether for the clergy or the laity, would seem to be one under which the characteristic excellences of the two methods were united, and the best refutation thus given to the popular prejudice, which excludes plain dealing,



and the sense of honour, and other special features of our national character, from the catalogue of Catholic, or at least of priestly, virtues. Whether these great social qualities be or be not duly valued in our English Catholic schools is a question irrelevant to this argument, which deals rather with principles than facts. But if (as I am quite willing to believe) they be so valued, I cannot help thinking that it arises from the salutary operation of specially English influences upon a system which, not in itself, but in its exaggerated or perverted forms, is unfavourable to them.

It has seemed well to say thus much, in the way which presented itself as most natural, upon the leading differences of those two systems with which we are now to compare a certain third system, viz. that of the English colleges and public schools of most ancient foundation in their purely Catholic days. It has been positively affirmed, and as positively denied, in the course of the late discussion, that the present public schools of this country are the lineal successors, in the theory and practice of moral education, as well as in their history, of the same institutions in their pre-Reformation state of existence. It has been less positively stated, but still apparently implied, that the Catholic collegiate system—not in that modified form in which we know it in England, but as it exists in the seminaries of France or Italy—is the true counterpart and proper representative of the ancient English method.

The first of these statements, which supposes the present public schools of England to be “of Catholic origin,” in any other sense of the words than the purely historical and external one, is surely a dictum whose strongest claim upon acceptance is its extreme *prima facie* improbability. To those who know any thing of our academical statutes, and who remember that our two oldest public schools were founded by men who were also founders of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, it was a startling assertion, that a state of things so essentially Protestant in its whole idea and complexion as that which has grown up in our public schools could be a development, or even a perversion, of any Catholic idea. As little likely did it seem that, if the present public-school system and spirit were those of the ancient Church of England, any thing so little akin to them as the present Catholic theory of education should have dropped from the clouds about the time of the Reformation, without so much as a type or adumbration in the preëxisting educational institutions of this Catholic land. Such researches into the

subject as I have been able to make are, on the whole, strongly confirmatory of these impressions.

There are but two of our greater public schools whose origin runs back into times of indisputable Catholicity, namely, Winchester and Eton. Other great English schools were either founded since the Reformation, or so near that great crisis as to have caught much of its spirit in entering upon their history. But Eton dates from the middle of the fifteenth century, and Winchester—its predecessor and pattern—from the latter end of the fourteenth. Wykeham's other great work, New College, Oxford, dates from nearly the same time as Winchester. The connection of these two foundations leads to the remark, that the present argument absolutely requires us to take the case of the universities into the account, as well as that of the public schools; and for this reason, if for no other, that such of the colleges as are of kindred origin with the public schools (namely, New College at Oxford, and King's at Cambridge) furnish evidence in their statutes of the common founder's spirit and intentions.

There is yet another obvious reason for including the universities among our witnesses to the character of ancient English education. Our Catholic colleges (those, at least, which are best known to most of us) contain students of various ages, ranging from ten or twelve to twenty-three or twenty-four. Boys come to them as young as they generally go to Protestant public schools, and remain in them two or three years later than the age at which they commonly leave the universities. I could never quite see, therefore, why the comparison instituted between the Catholic colleges and Protestant places of education was not made to embrace a wider range of evidence on the Protestant side. For a portion, at least, of the objection to "surveillance" in Catholic colleges is derived from its being applied to the older students; and had the ground selected for the comparison included the universities, I cannot think that even the strongest advocate of "surveillance" would have extended to *them* the objections felt against the public schools, from the fact of their leaving young people too much to themselves.

It is, then, to the ancient discipline of the colleges and public schools together, and not to that of either separately, that we are to look for the proper counterpart of our present Catholic seminary or collegiate practice. Let us begin with the colleges.

The description given by a discontented Cambridge scholar of his college-life, shortly before the time of the Reforma-



tion, furnishes a better idea of the actual state of things than can be gathered from the letter of statutes :

"The greater part of the scholars get out of bed," he says, "between four and five in the morning ; from five to six, they attend the reading of public prayers, and an exhortation from the Divine Word in their own chapels. They then either apply to separate study or attend lectures in common until ten, when they betake themselves to dinner, at which four scholars are content with a small portion of beef bought for one penny, and a sup of pottage, made of the gravy of the meat, salt, and oaten flour. From the time of this moderate meal to five in the evening, *they either learn or teach*, and then go to their supper, which is scarcely more plentiful than the dinner. Afterwards problems are discussed, or other studies pursued, until nine or ten ; and then about half an hour is spent in walking or running about (*for they have no hearth or stove*), in order to warm their feet before going to bed."\*

This picture, after some allowance for exaggeration, is probably correct enough, and certainly does not give an idea of college-life which would find much favour in modern times. Chaucer, writing of the universities rather less than a century and a half earlier, gives us a very different view of a student's life. There is a well-known tale which begins—

"Whilom ther was dwellyng in Oxenford  
A rich gnof, that gestes held to boorde,  
And of his craft he was a carpenter ;  
With him ther was dwellyng a poure scoler," &c.

Of this tale it is enough to say here, that it exhibits a very lax state of academical discipline. The "scoler" aforesaid is described as having a room to himself in the carpenter's house (this appears to have been an exception to general practice), as being addicted to astrology, and as following his vicious inclinations without let or hindrance. The picture given in the "Reves Tale" of the sister university presents no higher idea of the morality of some of the students, though it suggests certain notions of academical discipline which are wanting to the other. The two scholars whose exploits form the subject of the latter story are inmates of "Soler Hall" (said to be the old Clare Hall). They are represented as having to "crye besily uppon the wardeyn" for leave to go and visit the mill at "Trompyngtoun," where the corn was ground for the use of his college.

"And at the last the wardeyn gaf hem leve."

So, furnished with the "gere," and mounted "on an hors,"

"Forth goth Aleyn the clerk, and also Jon."

\* Huber on English Universities (F. W. Newman's translation).

Arrived at the mill, they make inquiries of the miller which might have raised a suspicion in a less simple mind as to the motives of their visit. Their horse (it was the warden's) gets loose, and they waste so much time in recovering him that the night closes in. The miller houses them; and a great deal follows which brings home to the mind some of the worst features of Protestant academical life.\*

The vast change which had taken place in the interval between one of these periods of academic history and the other, is due to that glorious work of educational reform which is associated with the names of such men as Wykeham and Waynflete. Chaucer's experience belongs to the latter half of the fourteenth century, about the time when Wykeham laid the foundation of the sister institutions of Winchester and New College, but before the effects of the change had come into play. During the whole of that century, the collegiate, as distinguished from the university, system, was in gradual course of formation. The "inns," or "halls," which furnished the basis, or at least the idea, of the colleges, were little more than lodging-houses. At first, the only condition imposed upon a student on entering one of the great English universities was, that, within a certain time after his arrival, he should enrol himself under some licensed teacher or regent-master. A house was taken by one of these teachers, who collected round him a body of pupils, and appears to have answered precisely to the character of a "tutor" at Eton or Rugby. Thus arose the halls, whose numbers, like that of the students, was at Oxford something absolutely fabulous. Oxford indeed appears to have been the great education-market of England, to which boys repaired for the article of learning as horsedealers resort to a fair. The collegiate was all but merged in the university character; and the constant gown and town riots, with the internal feuds of the different "nations," which embroiled the whole academical population at the period in question, are entirely inconsistent with any ideas of Catholic discipline, or indeed of any discipline at all.† Sometimes a certain number of students would club together and choose their own director, whether with or without the consent of superior authority. Some of these societies, as they received endowments, grew into colleges; others assumed the position now occupied by the halls at Oxford, as dependencies upon certain colleges, for the accom-

\* Elsewhere Chaucer gives a favourable picture of an Oxford student, which, it may be hoped, represented the average specimen of the class. But the above pictures must have had a foundation in facts.

† Huber on English Universities, edited by F. W. Newman.



modation of supernumerary members; while the greater part of the original halls disappeared altogether as the colleges arose into importance.

New College, though far from being the earliest of the colleges at Oxford, was the first which was modelled upon the splendid type of our great Catholic foundations. It consisted, at its origin, of seventy fellows; of whom ten were chaplains, and three directors of music. There were also sixteen choir-boys. About the same time, Bishop Wykeham founded the noble College of Winchester, which was to form a kind of preparatory school to "St. Marie's of Winton, at Oxenford," afterwards known, by reason, as would appear, of its unprecedented splendour, as the "New College." These twin sisters, about half a century later, formed the models of Eton and King's.

The erection of Winchester and New Colleges was quite an era in education. Till that time, the chapel and the appurtenances of Divine worship appear to have formed no part of the original arrangement. But of Wykeham's plan, the chapel was the principal feature; it was adorned with an image "of the Holy Trinity, of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, and of many other Saints," besides a variety of ornamental works of "curious subtlety," and furnished with "chapel-organ," magnificent vestments, and a ceremonial equipage of the most elaborate and costly description.

With men like Wykeham and Waynflete, these external matters were evidences of the ecclesiastical spirit which manifested itself in far more important ways, as we shall find when we look at the interior regulations of their colleges. The following are some of Wykeham's regulations:

"The members of his college were to live together according to the statutes. They all dined together in the refectory, where strict silence was preserved while the Holy Scriptures were read aloud. Indeed Wykeham had a peculiar care that his scholars should cultivate good manners; . . . . . he ordains that—even in times of recreation—they should address one another in a modest and courtly manner. . . . . Immediately after dinner, the juniors retired, and the seniors after them. . . . . In winter, a fire was lighted in the hall, that, after dinner and supper, the fellows might take honest recreation. Stringent laws were made against all excesses in dress, . . . . . and penances in the way of fasting imposed upon offenders."\*

This was at Oxford; at Winchester, similar arrange-

\* *Lives of Wykeham and Waynflete.* (Burns and Lambert.) This learned and interesting little volume has supplied much of the information contained in this article.

ments were made to secure good discipline and good manners among the boys. Their dress was strictly regulated. Many monastic customs were introduced into the college; for instance, every boy was obliged to sweep his own room and make his own bed. When the Protestant Bishop of Winchester, Trelawny, held his visitation of the college, in 1708, this custom was strongly condemned by him as "servile and foul." The scholars rose at five, and, after performing these menial offices, were expected to say private prayers till half-past five, when the bell summoned them to chapel.

Although the founder expressly forbade "*ludos incautos et inordinatos*," he was very careful to provide the boys with innocent recreations. Whether all readers will consider the ceremony of the "boy-bishop" as included in this class, may be doubtful; but at any rate they will appreciate the wisdom and kindness of the great prelate in making provision for a supply of "divers singers and dancers," who came periodically from Hopley to amuse the boys, besides conjurors, minstrels, and the like. We hear also of a real "live lion" sent by his Majesty, one cold January morning, to entertain the young collegians. The college entries bear witness also to payment for a "cart" to take the boys into the New Forest, that they might witness the stag-hunt. They speak likewise of wine furnished out at a picnic, besides an extra supply of viands at supper when the boys got home.

Magdalen College arose almost a century later, but was modelled according to the same rule. Waynflete's motto was, "Let all sciences militate under the banner of theology." Hence he appointed frequent lectures on Scripture and theological disputations to take place in his chapel of St. Mary Magdalene's College. "The design of the founder was to cherish in the hearts of the students a deep spirit of piety and practical religion, so that his college should be a nursery at once of science and of faith." The rule of life was very much the same as in Wykeham's college. The society rose at an appointed hour, and repeated certain prayers while dressing, the versicle, response, and antiphon of the Blessed Trinity, and a prayer for the founder. Other suffrages for the dead were to be used by each student during the day at his own convenience. Every one was to hear Mass daily. There was to be silence at dinner, with spiritual reading, and every evening vespers and a procession. The dress of the students was minutely regulated. When walking out, they were always to go two and two, as in Catholic colleges of this time. The want of necessary comforts of which the



Cambridge student complained to the Royal Commissioners of Henry VIII., has no precedent in Waynflete's or Wykeham's rules, which make special provision for a fire in winter at recreation-time. Card-playing was forbidden, together with such games as might disturb study or devotion; also the keeping of dogs and birds; but elegant and literary amusements were encouraged, such as music and the recitation of poetry. Above all, the students were liberally treated and abundantly fed; so that things must have sadly degenerated before the Reformation, if our Cambridge friend is to be trusted.

Intermediate between Wykeham's and Waynflete's noble works, comes the foundation of Eton and King's. The young king Henry turned his attention to the sister university, and under his auspices arose, in 1440, the "Kynge's College of our Lady of Eton, besyde Wyndesore." It was natural that the young king should look to Winchester for the model upon which to form his proposed establishments, and to Winchester therefore he repaired. There he fell in with Waynflete, at that time Master of Winchester School, and a cordial intimacy sprang up between them. Before Henry left Winchester, it was arranged that Waynflete and thirty-five of his scholars should remove to Eton, and begin to work out the new foundation.

And now, what was the life of the Catholic Eton boy? At five, the "surgite" of the præpositors summons him to rise. He recites prayers alternately with a fellow-student while dressing; after which, as at Winchester, he sweeps his room, and makes his bed. Every boy was required to recite the whole rosary every day. This was to be done in the cemetery, or in the cloisters, before High Mass. The five decades were to be said in expiation of sins committed by each sense. Besides, they were to say the Psalter of our Lady, and many Paters and Aves during the day. We hear also of the Confessions at Shrove-tide, the Communion on Holy Thursday, the Conferences on Good-Friday, and the early risings and mutual gratulations on Easter Day.

The school-exercises were often upon religious themes. On All Souls' Day, for instance, the Latin verses were on the hope of immortality. On St. John the Baptist's Feast, the dormitories were hung with pictures of the Saint, and songs were sung in his praise. In the midst of these holy doings, study was not overlooked. Latin verses were cultivated, and Latin speaking encouraged.

But there was plenty of harmless and healthy recreation; May-day gambols, and autumnal nutting-parties into Wind-

sor Forest. On the 1st of May, the boys might rise at four, and go out to gather may, "*provided they did not wet their feet.*" Before maying and nutting, however, they were to write verses on the charms of spring, and the lessons of autumn. On Midsummer-day, and on the Feast of St. Peter, they had bonfires; and on St. Nicholas's day, they elected the boy-bishop with extraordinary solemnity. It is characteristic of the affectionate intercourse which subsisted between masters and boys, that the boys were always "to share their nuts with their masters."

Let us now come to the arrangements made for the protection and superintendence of the younger boys. The following is from the old Eton Statutes (xxxvi., De Dispositione Camerarum):

"In singulis cameris puerorum supradictis, sint ad minus tres scholares honesti, ac cæteris scholaribus maturitate, discretionem, ac scientia provectiores, qui aliis consociis cameralibus studentibus *superintendant*, et eosdem diligenter *supervideant*, et de ipsorum moribus et conversatione, studiique profectu, præpositum, vice-præpositum, et magistrum informatorem\* de tempore in tempus, quotiens causa seu opus fuerit, sub ipsorum debito juramenti collegio præstiti supradicto, *cum requisiti fuerint*, veraciter certificent, et informant, ut hujusmodi scholares, defectum in moribus patientes, negligentes, seu in suis studiis desides, castigationem, correptionem, et punitionem percipiant juxta eorum merita debitas, ac etiam competentes."

The oath to which the foregoing extract refers was required of every scholar at the age of fourteen, and obliged him, if he knew of any "conventicula, conspirationes, vel confederationes" against the college or its master, "id præposito, vice-præposito, aut bursario, intimare, et eos expresse præmonere ore tenus, vel in scriptis."

In the statutes of Winchester College, from which those of Eton appear to have been taken almost *verbatim*, it is enjoined that boys shall give information to the authorities of grave offences among their companions; but under the same proviso, "*si requisiti fuerint.*"

Even at Cambridge, in very early times, the same rule existed as a safeguard against scandalous breaches of discipline or morality. "We enact, on pain of anathema, that, if any scholars know any one to go under the name of scholars, or have in their society any one who has no master, or who does not attend the ordinary lectures of his master, or who openly keeps his concubine, or is of bad repute in any way, either by manifest signs or by evidence of the fact, or a thief, or incontinent, or a disturber of the peace,—he shall de-

\* i. e. "informatorem morum," præfect of discipline.



nounce him to his master, or to the chancellor, in order that, after being denounced, he may be forthwith expelled from the university."

The statutes of Peterhouse College, Cambridge, provided that the rooms were to be assigned by the master, taking care that "two old scholars or two young ones do not dwell together in each room, but one old and one young . . . in order that the young man may be more profitably excited to learning and good morality by his older companion." At Clare Hall, the scholars were to live in the same room with the fellows.\* At Eton, again, choristers were chosen by the fellows, who lived in the same room with them, "ad serviendum eisdem." The same provision was made in the colleges at Oxford; as, for instance, at Magdalen, where the demies were to lodge in the same room with the fellows, "probably to perform service for them, and at all events to be under their control and superintendence."†

These materials will furnish an idea of the education of English youth in Catholic times, sufficient at all events for the present purpose. That education, it will have been seen, was not merely, as appears to have been thought, the present public-school education of Winchester or Eton, or the present academical education of Oxford or Cambridge, *plus* the sacraments of the Church, but a system every part of which was permeated by religion, and which, in structure at least, bears a strong resemblance to that in use among Catholics of this day. This conclusion might be made yet more evident, were there space to give fuller proof of the spirit and intentions of the founders.

To come now to the two points in which the present public-school discipline has lately been contrasted with that common, amid all local and circumstantial varieties, to all our Catholic colleges, namely, magisterial or vicarious supervision, and government through the agency of the students themselves. It is manifest that practices more or less answering to these descriptions existed in the theory, and entered into the actual conduct, of English education in old Catholic times. At Eton, for instance, older and younger boys were put together in the same rooms, in order that the older might "superintend" and "supervise" the younger.‡ At the two universities, also, something of a like arrangement was made for the mutual benefit of both parties. But

\* Cambridge Statutes (Heywood, 1855), p. 32, xviii., &c.

† Vide the *British Critic* for April 1840, Art. V., "On the Statutes of Magdalen College;" a paper full of valuable information on the present subject.

‡ "Fagging" is probably the modern form of this practice.

we find no provision whatever in the statutes, minute as they are, for extending this personal supervision to play-hours, nor do we know how far the same rule was applied later to students not on the foundation.

Again, with respect to the obligation of students to denounce their comrades in the event of graver faults. This obligation, it seems, was confined to the case of evidence which they were bound to give "when asked for it;" or, if the evil were one which struck at the root of discipline by implying a combination for the overthrow of authority, they were at once to reveal it, as appears, without waiting for inquiries.

This, at any rate, is not *espionage*, the essence of which is *secrecy*. It is an open and recognised system of government, under which, as there is no pretence for the charge of treachery, there can be no reasonable complaint of unfairness. One boy is as liable to it as another; the informer of to-day may be the informed against of to-morrow. It is quite a different thing, surely, from having one's steps dogged by a detective, or one's words noted down and reported by a companion who mixes freely with us under the mask of friendship. When a novice enters the Society of Jesus, he knowingly and voluntarily submits to the rule by which his words and actions are made liable\* to this kind of scrutiny; and the same was true of every boy who entered at Eton in Catholic times, or rather of every parent who allowed his son to become a subject of its discipline. All was above-board.

With the safeguards of discipline and morality required by the Eton statutes, let us for a moment compare those which are contemplated in the Treatise of St. Alphonsus on Seminaries.

"Il prefetto giri sempre per li corridori, i quali non debbono esser mai senza custodia, o senza occhi di alcuno. Uscendo i seminaristi fuori del seminario, egli attenderà ancora a vedere se n'è restato alcuno. Egli potrà entrare in tutte le camerate per visitare come si fa lo studio, come si osserva il silenzio, la recreazione, &c. Egli assisterà, quando vengono i barbieri, calzolai, sartori, acciò si eviti ogni disordine. E di tutte le inosservanze ne avviserà il rettore . . . . Tenga ancor (il prefetto) due, o almeno uno de i seminaristi per *esploratore*, che fedelmente e *in segreto* l'avvisi di qualche *difetto* di cui egli non si è potuto accorgere . . . . Sia attento in riferire al rettore i difetti di chiascheduno, specialmente si sono abituali, e più specialmente si sono contra l'onestà. Perchiò tenga una nota di difetti che più facilmente posson

\* Institutiones Soc. Jesu, vol. ii. cap. 15.



commettersi, per notarvi di sotto i nomi di coloro che le commettono." He then gives a list of such defects, and specifies speaking out of time, going to the gate without leave, and omitting the weekly confession.

I have noted the expressions in the above passage which seem to distinguish the rule of St. Alphonsus from that of Wykeham or Waynflete.

On the whole, while freely admitting, or, rather, earnestly contending, that there is a characteristic and fundamental difference between the ancient Catholic and the modern Protestant education of England, both as regards principle and details, I fancy myself to discern differences hardly less material between the ancient English and the modern (especially the foreign) Catholic type; and they are precisely such differences as will always be sure to characterise our national, in contrast to foreign, education. With all that is strict in principle and minute in rule about the educational system sketched out in the preceding pages, there is a generosity, a largeness of spirit, a parental tenderness about it, which render it a model, with whatever circumstantial variations, for the Church of all times. In the personal supervision which it includes, there is nothing which indicates suspicion on the one side, or interferes to any excess with liberty on the other. It is a kind of control calculated rather to assist than to thwart the development of personal character. In the means used for bringing the moral condition of the Society *veluti in speculo*, under the governor's eye, however in the sight of many modern theorists objectionable, there is, at all events, nothing mean nor underhand; while in the evident tokens of a constant view to the comfort, the recreation, and the health of the students (even to such suggestions, of an almost maternal tenderness, as the danger of "wet feet"), there is surely a most accurate, as well as a most beautiful, appreciation of the duties of that office which, next to the priesthood (if, indeed, not rather a department of it), is the likeliest of all on earth to His, in whom all family relations are harmoniously blended and archetypally represented.

However, it is the object of this Paper rather to exhibit certain facts than to found conclusions on them. Those facts have been produced less with the view of settling a controversy than of furnishing a basis of argument, upon which impartial disputants may meet with a better chance of mutual understanding than is offered by a contest on first principles, which may be protracted to an indefinite length without the prospect of approximation, much less of contact. But they seem, at any rate, to show that the common principles of

Catholic education, which are of no particular age or country, are subjected to great modifications in practice from the influence of national character—a position which might be further illustrated by a review of the history of English Catholic colleges on the Continent. This question, however, and that of the origin of the more stringent and inquisitorial system which prevails abroad, though collateral to the present subject, are not directly involved in it.

A. M. D. G.

---

---

AUBREY DE VERE'S POEMS.\*

LITERATURE influences patriotism in two ways, by national history and by ballad poetry. In all the catastrophes of a nation's life, when a mighty effort is required, or when extraordinary calamities rouse the deepest feelings of the people, they find comfort or encouragement either in the first and simplest, or in the latest and most complicated of the arts: one belongs more to the character of early times, when literature addresses itself to the ear; the other is most potent in a cultivated age. Poetry lives and flourishes under misfortune; history requires for its inspiration freedom and success, and owes its origin to the first great victory of freedom in the Persian war. A dominant race does not promote the study of the annals of the people or of the class it has subjugated, or does it with an elaborate purpose of falsehood and concealment; and for the same cause it was the policy of the Plantagenets to exterminate the bards in Wales, and in Ireland, from the time of Edward III. to the reign of Elizabeth, they are threatened with an increasing severity of punishment. Whilst Irish history is but slowly emerging from the obscurity and uncertainty, from the indifference and the neglect of ages, a poet—a Catholic and a patriot—has attempted to combine the influences of history and of song, and revives, with a distinct and open purpose which would have been fatal to him in less polished and less peaceful times, the memory of his country's many sorrows, and of that which has been for centuries her single consolation. "Inisfail, or Ireland in the olden time," is a series of poems, embodying a kind of chronicle of Ireland, and it is a suggestive indication of their spirit and tendency that they begin with the year 1170. There are two reasons

\* The Sisters, Inisfail, and other Poems. By Aubrey de Vere. (Longman, 1861.)



which induce me to question the wisdom of this limitation. Poetically it would have been better to begin with the record of Ireland's brightest period, when, by the teaching of her schools and by the example of her saints, she was the mistress of Western Europe. The darkness of her later day would have been made more striking by a glimpse of the glorious dawn :

"Apostle, first, of worlds unseen !  
For ages, then, deject and mean,—  
Be sure, sad land, a concord lay  
Between thy darkness and thy day" (p. 84).

Historically, too, we are not justified in attributing to the English conquest all the misery that has befallen the nation. The source of so much suffering was not wholly imported from England, but lay in the primitive circumstances of the country, in the very facts which led to the invasion, and which the invasion afterwards converted from deficiencies into gigantic evils. But it is not the province of a national poet to censure his country, and her woes are more interesting as well as more poetical than her defects.

The author himself says of his book: "Its aim is to record the past alone, and that chiefly as its chances might have been sung by those old bards, who, consciously or unconsciously, uttered the voice which comes from a people's heart." Unconsciously, perhaps, he has here touched on the most strongly marked characteristic of his poems. I say unconsciously, because he hardly does them justice in another passage, where he compares them to the national ballads of other countries. Those of most other nations which are preserved, especially of the Greeks, the Spaniards, and the Germans, are essentially of an epic character. They are narratives of enterprise, adventure, and achievement, and relate things that have been done; their heroes are men of action, and, whether they succeed or fail, have got something definite before them. Songs of this nature are warlike and vehement; their value is in the event they record, and they are a sort of substitute for history. Tacitus says of the ancient war-songs of the Germans, that this is the only form in which they preserve their traditions,—"*unum apud illos memoriæ et annalium genus*;" and there was little care for musical effect, for he tells us, "*affectatur præcipue asperitas soni et fractum murmur*." Exactly opposite in character is the song of the Irish Celt. It is vague, indefinite, purposeless; a poem of feelings, not of actions, plaintive, subjective, reflective, lyrical. The Irish bards expressed rather, as our author says, the feelings of the people's heart than the memory of

its deeds; their language was extremely soft and flexible, and their musical power was the most wonderful of their faculties. The ballads of Scott, Macaulay, and Aytoun tell their own tale, and we have no difficulty in believing that Livy composed the first decade of his history with the assistance of the early lays of Rome. It would be altogether impossible to put together a history out of poems that have so little of the narrative character as those which Mr. De Vere justly says are in the spirit of the old minstrelsy of Ireland. We generally require the title in order to know what the poem is about, and the title, which, by the by, is sometimes wanting, is very often insufficient. The few notes that are given only make us wish for more. There are not many readers who know enough of Irish history to supply the circumstances and motives of each poem, and a fuller commentary would be extremely instructive, as our curiosity and interest are excited by the poetry itself. It would be the more desirable inasmuch as it is one of the author's purposes to promote the knowledge of Irish history, the want of which is, and has been, a great misfortune to the people of both countries. "It might well be worth while," he says, "to inquire how far this ignorance has stood in the way of a kindly feeling between classes, and of an enlightened patriotism." And in one of the poems he appeals to a wider audience than his own countrymen:

"Unstaunch'd is the wound while the insult remains.  
 The Tudor's black banner above us still flieth,  
 The faith of our fathers is scorn'd in their fanes!  
 Distrust the repentance that clings to its booty;  
 Give the people their Church, and the priesthood its right.  
 Till then to remember the past is a duty,  
 For the past is our cause, and our cause is our might" (p. 278).

Here is an instance of the want of an historical commentary. A reader must be better versed in Irish history than an author has any right to expect of him, in order to find the explanation of these lines in an allusion to the statute of 1612, in which the distinction between English and Irish was verbally abolished, "with the intent that they may grow into one nation, whereby there may be an utter oblivion and extinguishment of all former differences and discorde betwixt them."

There is abundant evidence that even during the wars with the Danes a high civilisation survived, and at the time of the conquest both of Ireland and of Wales the inhabitants were more advanced in material culture than their conquerors. But in those things on which a people's existence



depends, and which constitute the solid framework of society and the foundation of political life, in their notions of property, and in their notions of the state which is inseparable from these, they were separated from the whole of that movement of creative ideas which made the middle ages a period of progress. The nature of the ownership of land is a distinctive type of difference between states. In the lowest stages of civilisation there is no appropriation of land. Hunting tribes are disconnected with it altogether, and nomads have property only in their herds. Pastoral life first creates a collective ownership in the land; but as the land is not the real source of wealth or object of labour, there is no impulse to go farther, and pastoral life retains a natural hostility to private property. An instance of this was the *Mesta* in Spain. Landowners were forbidden to enclose their fields, in order that when the flocks came down from the mountains to winter in the plains of Estremadura, and when they returned in the spring, they might be able to browse on the way. Russia is another instance, where the roving habits of pastoral life were so deeply rooted in the people that they would not settle permanently on any fixed piece of land until they were bound by serfdom to it; and whilst serfdom survives on the one hand as a sign of their former restlessness, the ancient communism in the distribution of land preserves, under totally different circumstances, and in another order of civilisation, the ideas of nomadic life. When agriculture is introduced, the land necessarily becomes fixed property, though not necessarily private property. It may be vested either in the family or in the *commune*.

We can trace in the history of Rome the parallel progress of the rights of landowners with the growth of the state. At first the land belonged to the state; it was *ager publicus*. Then it was held in lots by the people (*possessiones*); and this was ultimately matured into real ownership (*dominium*), when no such thing as collective or impersonal property was admitted, and what did not belong to an individual became *res nullius*. This system, the foundation and security of Roman freedom, was subverted by the accumulation of capital and of debt, and attempts were made to restore it for the benefit of the poor, and thus to save the state at the expense of the rich, by those agrarian laws which are the critical revolutions in Roman history. As the class of small proprietors disappeared, the strength of the state departed with them, and the land ceased to be tilled. The Teutonic notion of real property is based on freedom, but recognises the right of the family by inheritance, and therefore limits the power of sale.

At the same time it recognises the property of corporations, and retains as common property to this day wood, waste, and water. By admitting the right of corporations, the claims of the community, and the interests of the family, this system combines stability with liberty, and prevents the disorganisation of property, which ruined Rome, and which, by the excess of subdivision, has produced in France a reaction against all liberty in favour of a Slavonic communism. Where the latter subsists, it is generally in consequence of the predominance of pasturage; it hinders cultivation and enterprise, because, as Aristotle says (*Pol. ii. 1. 10*), that is least cared for which is common to the greatest number: it deadens the love of freedom by making despotism less oppressive; and it excludes from property all corporations excepting that species of community on which the system rests.

In Ireland this species of communism subsisted, and the community was the sept. In no country had the feelings of kindred greater power, but it was a power of a peculiar kind. It was a sentimental attachment, not a well-regulated duty, forming in many cases an artificial obligation that superseded law and right. It is, perhaps, not a consequence, but a symptom of this, that an affection equal to that of blood-relationship bound foster-brothers together, which gives a poetical but most unpractical and disorderly character to many passages of Irish history. This is the theme of the play that maintained for so many months an unexampled popularity in London, and exhibited this sentiment in all its beauty and in its danger to society. This family attachment was the basis both of government and of property. "Even those arts," says Burke, "which we are apt to consider as depending principally on natural genius were confined in succession to certain races;" and the land belonged to the race. Each Irishman had his part allotted to him by the chieftain, not even for life, not because it belonged to his father, but because he belonged to the sept. The constant redistributions of land seem to prove that agriculture did not generally prevail. In later times, to speak English, sow corn, and build stone houses, went to the character of an alien. This system had the political effect of making the individual dependent on the community, and intercepting at the same time the action of the state. The chief was responsible for the crimes of every man of his sept, and the custom of tanistry gave him a successor in his lifetime, and an organised opposition. But the fundamental point is the impersonal tenure of property, and the imperfect notion of inheritance. It resulted in a constant disturbance of society, in the absence of a strict code



of law, and in the exclusion of the Church from her proper position, influence, and rights; it was impossible for her to disengage her lands from the system of succession in the septs. To such a system of polity the Church was necessarily in a position of absolute antagonism.

In the middle of the twelfth century St. Malachi led the way to a great reform: synods were held, and a Cardinal-legate arrived from Rome, with the pallium for the four Archbishops. But the evil was not to be met by ecclesiastical reforms, by the abolition of simony and usury, the reformation of morals, or the institution of tithes. It lay in a region to which the influence of the clergy and the decrees of councils could not directly extend, in the political and economic habits of the people. The necessary conditions for the fulfilment of the public mission of the Church were wanting; a voluntary internal reform was impossible; there was no resource but in an appeal to another country. Every European land, from Thule to the Pillars of Hercules, had already obtained from the various tribes of one common stock the elements of a similar political development, with the germs of ecclesiastical freedom. The Celts and the Iberians, the Hungarians and the Slaves, all owed their polity to the German race, and the Church throughout Europe rested on the Teutonic institutions. In Hungary and in Bohemia the empire had served as an instrument by which civil order was established together with religion; and in Poland the Church destroyed the absolutism of the old Sarmatian government by encouraging the immigration of German colonists, and sheltered her own influence and immunity behind the *jus teutonicum*. And while this was going on in the North and West, Byzantium and Muscovy held aloof from the salutary influence, lapsed into schism, and never attained a Christian system of government. It was only those portions of the Teutonic race that had developed under a higher civilisation the national principles of their public life, who fulfilled for the Church this office of pioneers. The Anglo-Saxons had degenerated after the time of Dunstan; and in Ireland the Danes had no well-organised political system, and lived separate from the native inhabitants. Thus it came to be found, when a great effort was made by the Irish clergy to introduce a better order of things, that the English supremacy was necessary to that end; and the Holy See resolved to introduce into Ireland that national element whose influence was coextensive with the *Respublica Christiana*, and without which the Church had in no instance succeeded in obtaining a full and secure authority.

It is remarkable that the Synod of Cashel, the first that was held after Henry's arrival, occupies itself quite as much with the question of tithes and with the regulation of property as with matters purely religious. Leland, whose words are quoted with approbation by Lanigan, speaks with contempt of the small result of so great an enterprise as the English invasion, "as if the same futile ordinances had not been repeatedly enacted in every synod, held almost annually by the Irish clergy," for twenty years before. It was precisely because the enactment of them had proved futile that the transfer of the sovereignty was accomplished; and the original bull of Adrian IV. was issued very shortly after the Synod of Kells, which was the first great step taken by Rome in the movement of reform.\* Thenceforward the clergy were generally on the English side, which promised them fixity of tenure in land. For a long period, the king's writ ran only on the demesnes of the Church, and the Bishops supported the crown, not only against the Irish law, but even against the fusion of the races. But a prediction has been handed down from those early days, which a poet ought not to have overlooked. It was the boast of the Irish that Christianity had been established among them without violence and without martyrdom; and the absence of martyrs was cited by Giraldus as a reproach to the Irish Church. Maurice, Archbishop of Cashel, replied, that if that distinction was wanting to the clergy, it was an honour to the people. "But now a nation is come into this kingdom which knows how, and is accustomed, to make martyrs. Henceforth Ireland will, like other countries, have martyrs."

The mode in which the conquest commenced was decisive of the issue. The king held aloof for a time, and even recalled all his subjects from Ireland. Then he went over himself, but left the enterprise to the great nobles, who carried it on for their own advantage, not on behalf of the crown. The presiding motive was, therefore, not political, but selfish. Nothing in the state of England incited to migration, or contributed to keep up the supply of immigrants. The Spanish colonies in America exhibit the same defect; but the object of converting the natives secured to them the powerful protection of the Spanish crown. In Ireland the crown had neither sufficient power nor any very strong inducement to intervene between the conquerors and the peo-

\* Mr. Kelly, in his excellent notes to Lynch's *Cambrensis Eversus*, ii. 546, denies the connection between the revival of discipline in the Irish Church and the bulls of Adrian and Alexander; but he does not support his opinion, and altogether overlooks the political character of the ecclesiastical reform.



ple. The conquest of England had been the work of the Norman ruler and of his whole people, and it was undertaken by one of the largest armies ever known in the middle ages. It was a great public and political concern, and the laws of the two nations were not so different that they could not gradually coalesce. The natives were not deprived of their nationality or of their laws; and nothing drove them, like the Celts, to shut themselves off from the invaders. But in Ireland all this was different. It was held, not by the English state, but by a class of great nobles. They wished to subjugate it to themselves, not to be with the inhabitants fellow-subjects of the king. Consequently every precaution was taken to prevent the amalgamation of the races, or their union under a common law. It was an attempt by one race to rule over another, whilst it governed itself by a different code. This was the problem of the period before the Reformation. The only people of that age that had never known the institution of servitude were reduced to a subject caste. In all countries where the dominion of race over race has taken this form, in Poland, Hungary, and New Spain, the rise of a settled order of government has been impossible. It was a privilege to be an Englishman; and the right to the enjoyment of English law was a favour eagerly demanded by the Irish within the pale. When the hero of the old Muscovite party in Russia, General Yermoloff received some decoration from the Emperor Alexander, he begged to be made a German at once; all other honours and advantages would then, he said, be his as a matter of course. But in Ireland the people were anxious to obtain English laws and rights; and in 1278 all the king's Irish subjects offered a large sum of money to obtain charters of denizenship at once. Edward was willing to grant them, but the English colonists would not consent to lose their privilege, and the evil was perpetuated.

Not only was the distinction of the two races carefully preserved, but a third race arose, distinct from both, and without the advantages of either. These were the degenerate English, like the Pullani of the kingdom of Jerusalem, a grievous annoyance to the rulers. The Statute of Kilkenny, in 1367, put them on a level with the Irish enemy, and visited with the penalties of treason the practice of fostering, which had created between the Anglo-Normans and the Irish peasants an attachment which seemed to render a future reconciliation possible between the two nations. This statute amounted to a declaration of war against the Irish people. In 1413 they were forbidden to come to England, even to

study at English universities. It was forbidden to admit Irish novices into the monasteries within the pale. The clergy supported these laws, and drew down on themselves the rebuke of Innocent IV.: "Quia in omni gente qui facit justitiam acceptus est coram Deo, nec sanctuarium Dei convenit jure hæreditario possideri." The league of the clergy with the English crown seems to have deprived them of influence until the Reformation; and O'Neill accuses them, in his Remonstrance, of being "cowardly, and basely silent." The Statute of Kilkenny has inspired some of Mr. De Vere's best verse:

"Of old ye warr'd on men: to-day  
 On women and on babes ye war;  
 The noble's child his head must lay  
 Beneath the peasant's roof no more!  
 I saw in sleep the infant's hand  
 His foster-brother's fiercely grasp;  
 His warm arm, lithe as willow-wand,  
 Twines me each day with closer clasp . . . .  
 Through thee the puissant love the poor;  
 His conqueror's hope the vanquish'd shares.  
 For thy sake by a lowly door  
 The clan made vassal stops and stares; . . . .  
 Thy foster-brothers twain for thee  
 Would face the wolves on snowy fell:  
 Smile on! The Irish enemy  
 Will fence their Norman nursling well."

The Irish continued to look up to the Pope as their protector against the English, and their history does not exhibit either a grudge against the Holy See,\* or a dread of absolute monarchy. Indeed, the small part which the crown of England played in their country was not the least of their misfortunes, and the revival of the royal authority under the Tudors might have proved a great blessing to them; but the change of religion occurring at the same time converted the crown into a new source of oppression, whilst it united once more the people with the priesthood, and gave to the latter

\* In making Ireland a kingdom, Henry VIII. wished to repudiate the notion that the papal authority was the foundation of his title. Till then the Irish looked up to the Pope as their supreme lord and protector, and did not lay at his door the misery they endured, just as in Russia the oppression of the people by the boyars, instead of being a danger to the state, has confirmed the popularity and the power of the Czar. There is a singular view of these relations in a discourse on the mode of conquering Ireland, addressed to the Pope in the year 1590: "Li Rè d' Inghilterra contra d' ogni ragione et dovere si hanno intitolati Rè d' Irlanda, havendo l' ultimo Rè nostro come l' historie dicono, rissegnato il Regno al Papa, il qual ne diede poi il dominio al Rè d' Inghilterra, ch' era all' hora Henrico Secondo, come a vassallo di Santa Chiesa Romana, intitolandolo Signor d' Irlanda, riservando sempre il titolo di Rè alla Sede Apostolica; nè mai è stato Rè d' Inghilterra, che si chiamasse Rè d' Irlanda, finchè Henrico ottavo si fece poner inscriptione tale."



a popularity and an influence which had not been known since the English occupation. The passage of the supreme authority from the aristocracy to the crown inaugurated a new policy opposite to that which had been so disastrous. It had been the interest of the English nobles to keep the Irish a separate and remote class. It was the interest of the king to make them faithful and available subjects, like the English. The former had aimed at preventing civilisation; the new policy sought to destroy nationality. Henry ruled that no priest should be ordained who could not speak English; and this attempt to make the people English was a timely security to prevent them from being made Protestants.

But a new mode of oppression, altogether different from that which had been endured so long, came in before the Reformation as a fruit of the new policy by which the national differences were to be removed. During the prevalence of the policy of separation, the benefit of English law had been refused to the Irish; under the policy of absolutism and uniformity, the Irish laws and habits were ignored, and the harmony of their customs with the English ideas of law was assumed. It was not conceived that they could retain their national customs, and as it seemed hopeless that they could be reclaimed, a plan was proposed for repeopling the island altogether. Then the idea of putting away the Irish chiefs was suggested by the insurrection of the Geraldines, and it was supposed that their property and influence could be brought into English hands. In 1538, after the reduction of the Kavanaghs, the Council wrote to Henry that the insurgent chiefs had submitted, "offering to holde ther landes of your Highnes, and to paie your Grace a yerely rent for the same," but they advise the king "clerely to exile them." "Noither do we meane, when we speke or motion to conquest or exile theis men, that we wolde banishe all the inhabitantes ther, but the gentilmen, and men of warre; and, haveng garrisonnes of men of warre in certen principall placis, to reteyne still the most of the poor erthe tillers ther, which be good inhabitauntes."\* This was the system which recommended itself to the absolute monarchy, after the old oligarchical government had passed away in the Wars of the Roses. The rebellion of the O'Connors and O'Moores, in the centre of Ireland, soon furnished an opportunity of testing the new scheme. Under Mary Tudor their territories were confiscated and were made shire-land, by the names of King's and Queen's County,—the only shires made since the reign of

\* State Papers, III. 100.

John. The chiefs themselves were detained in a splendid captivity in England. The purpose of the confiscation was less to punish their rebellion, than to destroy that system of septs and tanistry which had been allowed to flourish for 400 years, but which was an insurmountable obstacle to the design of assimilating Ireland to England. This policy, which struck at the root of Irish society, continued for a century and a half, and is the second great calamity that befel the country. The policy of the English oligarchy in the middle ages, of which the most pointed example is the Statute of Kilkenny, had stopped the growth of Ireland, and had shut it off from the advancement of the times. The policy of the monarchy, founded on the right of forfeiture, despoiled the people of their property, and reduced to poverty and dependence the true owners of the soil. For the ownership was not vested in the offending chief,—all the sept had a partnership in it; and the property as well as the authority of the chief was not his to dispose of. This theory of power is expressed in the poem "The True King."

" Who were they, those princes that gave away  
     What was theirs to keep, not theirs to give ?  
 A king holds sway for a passing day ;  
     The kingdoms for ever live.  
 The tanist succeeds when the king is dust ;  
     The king rules all, yet the king hath naught.  
 They were traitors, not kings, who sold their trust ;  
     They were traitors, not kings, who bought."

The English could not understand that there was any alternative form of jurisdiction besides property and sovereignty. In earlier times, when the feudal system established a hierarchy of powers,—when a baron bore as much the character of a sovereign as of a subject, and the nature of sovereignty was imperfectly defined,—the position of a great feudal chief would not have been deemed incompatible either with the rights of the crown or with the rights of property of his men. In an age of absolutism, the territories of the chiefs could not be regarded as their dominions, and were therefore treated as estates. If their authority was not inseparable from their property, it was an anomaly highly dangerous to the prerogative of the crown. Any other relation between the chief and the sept but that of landlord and tenantry, would imply a revival in Ireland of that aristocratic might which it had cost the monarchy a long and terrible conflict to destroy. The Statutes of Liveries had been a powerful weapon against the nobles under Henry VII., and a rich mine of wealth in the hands of Empson and Dudley. "These handsome gentlemen," said the king to the Earl of Oxford,



when he found him surrounded by a host of retainers, "are doubtless your menial servants." And the earl confessed that they were his retainers, and was mulcted, it is said, for the breach of law, in 15,000 marks. It was not possible that Ireland should long preserve so distasteful a privilege. But the tyranny of the system consisted in this, that it was not, as in England, a blow at the power of the aristocracy, but a revolution in the rights of property which fell most heavily on the poor. The English nation had not then, and they have not yet, that flexibility and tolerance which is necessary in order to bear with the peculiar habits and ideas of another race. This incapacity has followed them every where, and in every clime it has been the curse of their power. They are the best colonists that the world has ever seen, because they maintain with admirable tenacity, under all circumstances, the system of property and of government which has made them great at home. But they are the worst civilisers among colonising nations, because they exhibit the same tenacity in their intercourse with others. The troubles in Canada, in New Zealand, in Ionia, and even in India, where the dominion of the Company called forth an amount of administrative ability that has never been shown in the service of the state,—all these have been due to the same constitutional defect that has ruined Ireland.

The policy introduced by the Tudors was continued by the Stuarts. James abolished tanistry, and what was called Irish gavelkind, and commenced the scheme of plantations on the ruins of the sept. The power of the chiefs, we are told, "sodainly fell and vanished." And then, first by the inquiry into defective titles, and afterwards by ingenious provocation to rebellion, an immense part of the soil of Ireland was confiscated, and society utterly disorganised.

Evils such as these have not been suffered by any Christian nation in modern times, and they were aggravated by the rise of Protestantism. But the religious animosity which made the sufferings more bitter was not their cause. The Reformation was the third great calamity of Ireland; but the others were enough to make her history the most painful that men have recorded. They were first of all the policy of a foreign aristocracy, that refused to her the benefits of a higher form of government and of society; and then the policy of a foreign absolutism, that deprived her of her own. At the present time, these causes have spent their force and have done their havoc, and their consequences are concentrated in one thing,—the ascendancy of the religion of the minority. It inherits all the results and all the power for

evil of the policy of social degradation, and of the policy of indiscriminate confiscation. The spirit of both survives and triumphs in the Establishment ; alone it is a sufficient substitute for all the other traditional modes of oppression, and an effective counterpoise for the things that have been conceded.

And this, if I understand the accomplished writer of whose book I have attempted to give a political summary, is the idea which Mr. Aubrey de Vere wishes to bring home to his readers. The spirit of his patriotism has, like his verse, its strength in religion ; and his practical view tends to represent the Irish Protestant Church as perpetuating whatever has been most tyrannical in the dealings of England towards Ireland. He has not exhausted the poetical themes with which the history of his country abounds, and he has not given its just prominence and proportion in the catalogue of wrongs to the revolutionary treatment of the Irish system of property, which renders the confiscations more oppressive and more monstrous than any which in troubled periods have been inflicted elsewhere ; but he has described in some of his most touching lines the great grievance of Ireland in the Middle Ages, and he shows a just and clear perception of the remedy which is needed in order to remove that which keeps alive in our time the sorrows and the anger of the past.

T. C.

---

---

EDMUND CAMPION.—No. V.

WHEN the English College at Rome was founded, in 1579, a Welshman, Maurice Clennock, was appointed president. His partiality to his countrymen excited factions which led to "mischief and almost murder," and maddened the students to that pitch that they were ready to forswear Allen and forsake "whom and what else soever," rather than continue under the Welsh rector. The tumults were not entirely calmed by the appointment of two Jesuits for the moral and literary superintendence of the scholars, for this only angered the Welsh faction against the society, which they accused of having stirred up these tumults underhand, in order that the fathers might gain possession of the college ; not that they wished to send the English students to the mission, but rather to keep them at Rome and make them Jesuits. This party thought the fathers had "no skill nor experience" of the state of England, or of the nature of Englishmen, and that



their "trade of syllogising" was quite alien from the intellectual habits of this country. Allen wrote from Paris, May 12, 1579, that he feared, if these broils continued, "our nation would be forsaken both of the Jesuits and ourselves, and all superiors else;" and wished to God that he might go for a month to Rome, and either make up these extreme alienations of mind, or else end his life.

Allen accordingly went to Rome, and found that the best way of reconciling the factions was for the Jesuits to take part in the English mission. The cause was debated between him and Mercurianus, the general of the society, his four assistants, Claudius Acquaviva, the Roman Provincial, afterwards General, and Father Parsons. The arguments for the mission were founded upon several considerations,—the piety, the necessity, and the importance of the work; the desire of the English Catholics; the notable encouragement and help it would be to the seminary priests if they had Jesuits, not only to assist them abroad in their studies, but at home in their conflicts; the increasing intensity of the war, which now required more men; the comfort it would be to the English Catholics to see religious men begin to return thither again after so long an exile, and especially such religious as could not pretend to recover any of the alienated property of the orders; the propriety of the Jesuits engaging in the mission, since the object of their foundation was to oppose the heresies of the day. It was urged also that Englishmen were more neighbours than Indians, and had greater claims for spiritual help; for it was more obligatory to preserve than to gain; and a token that the Jesuits were called to accept the mission was to be found in the fact that there were more Englishmen in the society than in all the other orders together. Moreover, the Jesuits had been the professors and the directors of the seminary priests, and had exhorted them to undertake their perilous enterprise. It was not seemly for those who were sending men at the risk of their lives to bear the burden of the day and the heat, themselves to stand aloof. And how could the fathers expect to be acceptable to the English nation after the restoration of religion, if they refused to bear their share of the toil and the danger of restoring it? Lastly, as the Order of St. Benedict at first converted England, the society of Jesus might fairly hope for the glory of reconverting it.

In reply to these arguments, it was urged that so grave a matter must not be too hastily settled; that it was a hard thing to send men to so dangerous a place as England, where the adversaries, though Christians in name, were more hostile, more eager, more vigilant, and much more cruel than

the infidels of the Indies were then, or than the heathen Saxons formerly were when St. Augustine went over; that the superiors, who would have no difficulty in persuading the English Jesuits to face the risk of martyrdom, had great difficulty in deciding whether the loss of such men did not far outweigh the hope of gain by their labours. Again, the English Government would at once publish a proclamation declaring that the Jesuits had not come over for religious, but only for political purposes, and would thus make the missionaries odious, and their actions doubtful. It would require more wisdom than could be expected in the mass of men to unravel the web and detect the fallacy. The charge would either be believed, or men would remain in suspense till the event was seen. Again, the method of life which priests were obliged to practise in England was totally incompatible with the constitutions of the society. Whilst the external danger was a recommendation, the spiritual perils must give them pause. They would be obliged to go about in disguise, and hide their priesthood and their religious profession under the garb and swagger of soldiers; they must live apart from one another, and consort with men of doubtful character; they would be sent back to the world to escape from which they had sacrificed themselves. They would be overwhelmed with business, and there would be no facilities, as in India, for renewing their relaxing fervour by frequent retreats. They would have no rest, no silence; they would be in everlasting hurly-burly. And then they would be accused of treason, and hunted about as traitors. And on occasion of disputes with the other priests, there were no bishops in England to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and it seemed difficult to believe that so many priests and religious could live together in one realm without jars and discords.

It was long before any decision was made. Allen went to the Pope, who removed the last difficulty by sending Dr. Goldwell, who had been Bishop of St. Asaph in Mary's reign, to be the ordinary of all England. The other objections were overruled, chiefly through the arguments of Claudius Acquaviva, who asked to be sent on the mission, and of Oliverius Manareus, the assistant from Germany, who, as a Belgian, knew the state of England through the English exiles who swarmed in his country. It was determined that the society should take part in the English mission, and a paper of instructions was drawn up for the guidance of those who should be first sent. The missionaries were reminded of the virtue and piety, and of the prudence, required for dwelling safely in a nation of shrewd, experienced, and unscrupulous enemies:



to preserve the first, they were to keep the rules of the society as far as circumstances would allow ; for the second, they were to study with whom, when, how, and about what things they were to speak, and to be especially careful never to commit themselves, either amid the temptations of good fellowship, or by hasty and immoderate zeal and heat. Their dress, though secular, was to be grave, and the habit of the society was only to be worn when they were quite safe, and then only for sacred functions. If they could not live together, they were at least to visit one another frequently. With regard to their intercourse with strangers, they were to associate with men of the higher ranks, and rather with reconciled Catholics than with those who were still in schism. They were to have no personal dealings with heretics, but were to employ laymen to manage all the preliminaries of conversion, to which they were themselves only to put the finishing stroke. They were not to be over-ready to engage in controversy, and then were to abstain from all sarcasm, preferring solid answers to sharp repartees, and always putting first the very best and strongest arguments. They were to avoid familiar conversation with women and boys, to take especial care never to deserve the reputation of chatter-boxes, or of alms or legacy hunters ; “ they must so behave that all may see that the only gain they covet is that of souls.” They must not carry about any thing forbidden by the penal laws, or any thing that might compromise them, as letters ; except for the strongest reasons, they must never let it be publicly known that they were Jesuits, or even priests. “ They must not mix themselves up with affairs of state, nor write to Rome about political matters, nor speak, nor allow others to speak in their presence, against the queen,—except perhaps in the company of those whose fidelity has been long and steadfast, and even then not without strong reasons.”

It would have been too much to expect that the English Jesuits should have no political opinion at all, or that what they had should be favourable to Queen Elizabeth. But short of proscribing all political action whatever, the instructions given to the first Jesuits certainly shut up such action within the narrowest possible limits ; they were to do nothing, and only to speak out their opinions in the most select company. The only political action that was to be allowed them was one for which the government of Elizabeth ought to have been thankful to them. They were “ to ask the Pope for an explanation of the declaration of Pius V. against Elizabeth, which the Catholics desired to have thus explained : That it should always bind her and the heretics ; but that it should

in no way bind the Catholics, while things remain as they are ; but only then when public execution of the said bull shall be possible." My readers will remember that St. Pius V. excommunicated not only Elizabeth and her abettors, but also all who obeyed her and her laws. So that the unfortunate Catholics were placed between two fires, hanged if they did not obey, cursed if they did. Campion, on his first arrival at Rome, had been consulted about the practical effect of this bull, and had declared that it procured great evils to the Catholics ; Cardinal Gesualdi had told him that it might without doubt be so mitigated as to allow the Catholics to acknowledge the queen without censure ; and now, before going to England he asked for and obtained only this mitigation, not probably because it was all he thought useful, but because it was all he could hope to get. The proviso, "*rebus sic stantibus*," "whilst things remain as they are," was, I suppose, inserted by some one who knew what hopes the Roman court just then entertained of the subversion of the government of Elizabeth, and the substitution of a Catholic sovereign on the throne of England.

With regard to the use that was to be made of lay instructors for the preliminaries of conversion, to begin the building which the fathers were to finish, we have the following notice : "Since sundry persons, priests and others, in England have determined to imitate the life of the Apostles, and to devote themselves wholly to the salvation of souls and the conversion of heretics ; and the better to do this, have determined to be content with food and clothing, and the bare necessities of their state, bestowing all the rest of their goods for the common needs of the Catholics, to collect alms for this common fund, and to promote the conversion of England in other ways ;" the Pope was asked to approve and bless this association, and to give sundry indulgences to those members who promised to practise the rules as well as they could, whether in prison or out of prison. These, and sundry other indulgences and faculties, were granted by the Pope to Father Parsons and Father Campion, the two Jesuits first sent on the mission, April 14, 1580 ; and by a brief dated two days later they were enabled to communicate all their privileges to the secular priests employed on the missions of England, Ireland, and Scotland.

In spite, however, of the extraordinary privileges which the Jesuits enjoyed, they were but a small part of the force which Dr. Allen had persuaded the Pope to send into England at this time. The army of missionaries was led by Dr. Goldwell, the Bishop of St. Asaph ; with him were Dr. Mor-



ton the Penitentiary of St. Peter's, and four old priests of the English hospital, Dr. Brumberg, William Gibley, Thomas Crane, and William Kemp; Lawrence Vaux, the old prior of Manchester, was drawn from his cell at Louvain, and several young priests from Rheims joined in the company. The Catholic association had already been organised in England by William Gilbert, a young man of property, who had been converted by Father Parsons in Rome early in 1579, and had been sent back to England to prepare for the enterprise which was already on the anvil; three young priests from the English College, and two laymen, who thought to take a leading part in the association, accompanied the fathers from Rome. Finally, there were the two fathers, with Ralph Emerson, a lay brother; and thus all ranks in the Church—priests, both secular and regular, and laymen—had their share in this great spiritual enterprise.

It would have been well for English Catholicism if there had not been another enterprise in hand, of a very different character, but aiming at the same object,—the reduction of the British islands to the obedience of the Pope. Unfortunately there is a perfectly overwhelming mass of evidence to show that the proviso "*rebus sic stantibus*" in the mitigation of the Bull was introduced with an intention too plain to be misconstrued. I have already quoted a letter from Dr. Sanders to Dr. Allen, in which he tells of the Pope being ready to give 2000 men for an expedition into Ireland. While Allen was at Rome, the Roman government organised this force, and the expedition must have sailed soon after the missionaries started from Rome, since it reached Ireland about the same time that Parsons and Campion were entering England. The expedition, and the part that the Roman government took in it, was no secret to the diplomatic body of Europe; Corrado, the Venetian ambassador at Rome, related to his government on his return in 1581\* how the Pope spent 230,000 scudi upon it, and an account of an Irish agent of the Vatican, announcing the safe arrival of the "five great ships full of soldiers and munitions of war, sent by the Holy See," has been published by Theiner.† Further, a brief of Gregory XIII., dated May 13, 1580, and doubtless intended to be distributed in Ireland by Dr. Sanders and the leaders of the expedition, gives plenary indulgence, such as was given to Crusaders, to all who join John Geraldine or his brother James, or help them "with counsel, favour, supplies, arms, or in any other way," as may be seen in O'Sullivan's History, chap. 17. The English government

\* Relazioni, vol. x. p. 282.

† Annales Ecclesiastici, vol. iii. p. 217.

was as well informed as any other, as is evident from the French ambassador's despatches from London, giving an account of the whole expedition, and of its disgraceful failure. It was commanded by an Italian, San Giuseppe, and Dr. Sanders was attached to it; and afterwards, whenever a priest was captured in England, he was asked what he thought of the conduct of the Pope and Sanders, and generally condemned to die if he refused to qualify it; and at the time of Campion's trial the attorney-general cynically observed that the Jesuits had arrived here "as it seemeth of purpose to answer the doings of those rebels there" in Ireland.

The policy of combining these two expeditions is hard either to be justified or to be understood. But I will venture a few remarks on the subject. First, the distinction between the temporal sovereignty of the Pope over his own states, his temporal supremacy over other princes, and his spiritual power over the whole Church, was not in those days accurately drawn; law had not yet altogether superseded force, and divines like Stapleton still held that it was part of the Pope's duty to put down heretical princes by the same violent methods that one prince might employ against another. Next, the distinction that was made between the Papal treatment of Ireland and that of England corresponded to the difference of the Papal rights to the two islands respectively. The Pope had been the acknowledged donor of Ireland to the English crown; his suzerain rights had always been more or less acknowledged, whereas his feudal superiority over England, though admitted by King John, had been always indignantly denied by the people and the other kings. He, therefore, had a right to interfere in Ireland with higher hand than he could use in England. It must be remembered that the Pope had long since committed himself in Ireland by the aid and encouragement he had given to James Geraldine, the father of the present leaders of the Irish insurgents, who had lost his life in the Papal cause. Such forcible attempts had been made in England, and had failed, and there was no present prospect of renewing them. England then could only be assailed by spiritual weapons. And it was hoped that the Pope would for the present be considered as only a spiritual person in his relations with England, though he was behaving as a temporal belligerent in Ireland,—much as the Emperor of China was lately at peace with us at Peking, and at war in Canton. Perhaps also the Italians thought they could conceal the intricacies of their policy from the blear eyes of the Northern barbarians.

It is strange to see how often the acute and subtle



countrymen of Machiavelli fail through not giving credit to others for equal acuteness, and through believing that others will be caught in a web of sophistry that Italians can disentangle with ease. It is not difficult to understand into what a false position the Jesuits and the other missionaries were thrown by the Irish expedition, and how entirely they were compromised; imposed upon themselves, it was their mission to impose upon others likewise, and to make believe that the Bull was so modified as to make the relations between Pope and Queen compatible with the continual allegiance of Catholics. Yet, after all, the famous mitigation amounted in reality to no more than an ill-conceived attempt to pretend to be at peace with the queen in England, while open war was being made upon her in Ireland. And yet there can be no doubt that this double dealing was a strictly logical result of the attempt to guarantee the Pope's spiritual power through his temporal power, or that the persevering attempt to preserve the temporal rights over Ireland which the Popes held in trust most materially interfered with the independence of their spiritual power in England, and disappointed the well-founded hopes of reducing our country to the faith. It is scarcely possible to say this in stronger words than it is said by Parsons himself in his *Ms. life of Campion*. He thus describes the dismay with which he first heard of it from Dr. Allen at Rheims, just before he and Campion crossed over into England:

“Dr. Allen also told us that he had heard from Spain that Dr. Sanders was just gone into Ireland, by the Nuncio Mgr. Sega's orders, to comfort and assist the Earl of Desmond, Viscount Basinglas, and others that had taken arms in defence of their religion, and had asked the Pope's help, counsel, and comfort in that cause. Though it belonged not to us to mislike this journey of Dr. Sanders, because it was made by order of his superiors, yet were we heartily sorry, partly because we feared that which really happened, the destruction of so rare and worthy a man, and partly because we plainly foresaw that this would be laid against us and other priests, if we should be taken in England, as though we had been privy or partakers thereof, as in very truth we were not, nor ever heard or suspected the same until this day. But as we could not remedy the matter, and as our consciences were clear, we resolved through evil report or good report to go on with the purely spiritual action we had in hand; and if God destined any of us to suffer under a wrong title, it was only what He had done, and would be no loss to us, but rather gain, in His eyes who knew the truth, and for whose sake alone we had undertaken this enterprise.”

The papers that relate to the mission of 1580 reveal ano-

ther difficulty that was occasioned by the intimate union between the temporal and spiritual grandeur of the Church, and by the feudal state with which it was considered necessary to surround her prelates. I have already related how Bishop Goldwell was at the head of the mission; he failed to penetrate into England, and no other Bishop was sent in his place. After nearly thirty years the ordinary jurisdiction over England was conferred on an archpriest, and in the lamentable disorders that followed, the Jesuits, and especially Father Parsons, were accused of having by their intrigues prevented the appointment of Bishops, in order to keep the management of affairs in their own hands. This accusation is scarcely fair; we have seen that one of the objections to sending the Jesuits at all was the absence of episcopal authority in England, and that they were not sent till a Bishop was sent with them. It was not their fault that Goldwell was taken ill at Rheims, and that "before he recovered, the persecution in England had grown to be so rigorous that it seemed not good to the Pope to adventure a man of that age and dignity to so turbulent a time, and so called him back to Rome, where he lived in the love of all men and in universal opinion of sanctity till his death in 1584."\* It was not the Jesuits' fault that Watson, the Bishop of Lincoln, was kept so close in Wisbeach Castle, till his death in 1584, that he could perform no episcopal duties. The Jesuits had no sooner arrived in England than they began to beg for Bishops. In September 1580, Parsons wrote, "There is immense want of a Bishop to consecrate the holy oils, for want of which we are brought to the greatest straits, and unless his Holiness makes haste to help us in this matter we shall be at our wit's end." Again, in 1591 he renewed his request, and got Sarmientos, the Bishop of Jaen, to promise him a competent support for two or three Bishops.† In 1597 he again presented a memorial to the Pope and Cardinals, praying for the appointment of two Bishops *in partibus*;‡ but soon afterwards, finding the objections at Rome insurmountable, he changed his plan, and asked for the appointment of an archpriest.

The real reason why no substitute was provided for Goldwell was, as Parsons says, because the Pope did not like to adventure the episcopal dignity in such turbulent times. That this was the received theory at Rome is proved by the pamphlet of "Franciscus Romulus" (supposed to be Bellarmine) on the Papal duty of dethroning evil princes, published at Rome in 1588. The writer feels it necessary to apologise

\* F. Parsons. † Brief Apology, 101. ‡ Tierney's Dod. vol. iii. p. 47.



for the primitive Bishops not dethroning princes; "for those were times," he says, "when it behoved Bishops rather to be ready for martyrdom than for coercing kings." This announcement drew down a storm of reproaches; "what then, are these times when Bishops must be men of war and not martyrs? Is it not the strength of the Reformation that our Bishops are more ready to kill than to be killed, that they think heresy can be better exterminated with the bodies of heretics than wiped out of their minds by argument and good example? Is not the rebellion more against the wealth, the secular power, the pride of the clergy, than against the doctrines of the Church?" Bellarmine knew all this, and did not intend to deny it, but his opponents took occasion by his words to argue against an idea that was supposed to be powerful at the Vatican.

And that this supposition was not unfounded is clear from the following letter, written from Rheims to the Pope by Goldwell, July 13, 1580, who had been "a month cured of his fever, and yet not well either in mind or body, but waiting for the decision of his Holiness."

"*BEATISSIMO PADRE*,— If I could have crossed over into England before my coming was known there, as I hoped to do, I think that my going thither would have been a comfort to the Catholics, and a satisfaction to your Holiness; whereas now I fear the contrary, for there are so many spies in this kingdom, and my long tarrying here has made my going to England so bruited there, that now I doubt it will be difficult for me to enter that kingdom without some danger. Nevertheless, if your Holiness thinks differently, I will make the trial, though it should cost me my life. Still it would be impossible for me alone to supply the wants of the Catholics, who are more by many thousands than I thought, and scattered over the whole kingdom. The most that I can hope to do is to supply for the city of London and some miles round. And therefore, in my ignorance, I cannot but marvel how it is that, after God has given your Holiness grace, as it were, to plant anew and support the Catholic faith in that kingdom, you make so many difficulties about creating three or four titular Bishops to preserve and propagate it,—a thing that might be done with as little expense as your Holiness pleases; for God has so inclined the minds of the priests to spend their lives in promoting the reduction of that kingdom to the Catholic faith, that, after being made Bishops, they would be contented to live as poorly as they do now, like the Bishops of the primitive Church. God inspire your Holiness to do that which shall be most to His honour, and prosper you many years. I humbly kiss your feet.—Your Holiness's most devoted servant, *THE BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH.*"\*

After this it will be impossible to doubt from what quar-

\* Theiner, *Annales*, vol. iii. p. 700.

ters the difficulties about sending Bishops to England originally proceeded. It may be that the Jesuits, after enjoying for twenty years the consequence that accrued to them through the absence of Bishops, preferred another arrangement; but they had always asked for Bishops, and their request had been refused, because feudal power and ecclesiastical authority had become so mixed up together in men's minds, that they feared the scandal of a poor Bishop, hiding from his pursuers, disguised like a soldier, mariner, or serving-man, living in garrets, inns, woods, caves, or barns, wandering over the land, and at last dying ignominiously on the gallows. It would have been easy enough to find men contented to live in apostolic poverty, but it was impossible to get them consecrated under such conditions. Etiquette and routine prevailed, and the Church in England was left without Bishops till the factions had grown so furious among the clergy that the measure which might have been a successful preventive was not strong enough to be an adequate cure.

Father Parsons, Campion's superior in the mission, was his junior in age and in religion; but he had talents better suited for administration and management. Inferior in eloquence, and in enthusiastic simplicity of purpose, he had a deeper knowledge of men and things, greater versatility, a finer and subtler policy, and as strong a will. He was also *notus Pontifici*; and the regulations of the society say, "those who are sent on missions should be exceedingly well-known to the superior." Parsons had always lived in the metropolis, Campion had been buried in a distant province. It is, perhaps, one of the inconveniences of any centralised system, that it tends to give the advantage to showy talent known at headquarters over deeper merit obscured by distance. Both Parsons and Campion were doubtless "well proved, especially in obedience," and "ready to go any where without excusing themselves," though Campion had practised the more complete abnegation of will. They were furnished with the instructions from which I have already quoted, which descended to particulars about things and persons in a way that must have given a very diplomatic air to those who implicitly followed such orders. The rule prescribed that the missionaries should be at least two, and that for a very fervent and courageous man a cooler and more circumspect companion should be chosen; in this expedition the prudence was Parsons', the zeal was Campion's. Simple as a child, he knew he was marching to his death; still he affected no more courage than he felt, but owned and made a joke of his fears. The flesh was weak, but the will was strong, and though the body trembled and the



teeth chattered, in the depths of his soul he loved the danger that he contemplated so clearly, and deliberately courted the self-sacrifice. To apply his own words about St. Wenceslaus to himself, "Quid faciat? Eat? Matrem, qualem illam cunque, matrem tamen oppugnabit. Non eat? amabit tyrannidem, prodet innocentes, Christum deseret. Vicerunt piorum lacrymæ, bonitas causæ, periculi magnitudo;" every thing he thought, should be risked rather than the salvation of a single soul. Parsons was a man of more animal courage, but he did not obtain the grace of martyrdom. *Finis coronat opus*, and martyrdom is generally the seal of merit.

Campion, as I said, reached Rome April 5, 1580. There "the youth of the English College wished to have him with them for one or two days, and to hear him preach;" and five of them accompanied him to England. He remained till April 18th; on that day Robert Owen, a Welsh exile for the faith, wrote to Dr. Humphrey Ely at Rheims a letter which fell into the hands of Walsingham's agents, and conveyed the first intelligence of the mission to the English government. "My Lord of St. Asaph and Mr. Dr. Morton are gone hence, some say to Venice, some to Flanders, and so further, which if it be true you shall know sooner than we here. God send them well to do whithersoever they go, and specially if they be gone to the harvest. The sale that Mr. Dr. Morton made of all his things maketh many think *quod non habet animum revertendi*. This day depart hence many of our countrymen thitherward, and withal good Father Campion." Another agent furnished Walsingham with a list of the English scholars in Rome; the English gentlemen at Rome, Rheims, Paris, and Douai; and of those that departed from Rome, April 18, with Edmund Campion and John (Robert) Parsons. These were Ralph Sherwin, who had been leader of the movement of the English scholars against Maurice Clenock and the Welshmen, Luke Kirby and Edward Rishton, priests, and Thomas Bruscoe and John Pascal, lay students, the firstfruits of the recently erected English college, the four Marian priests of the hospital whom I have named above, Ralph Emerson, a Jesuit lay brother, and another not named. They were accompanied by Sir Richard Shelly, the English Prior of Malta, and almost all the Englishmen then in Rome, and by Father Oliverius Manareus and other Jesuits sent by the General, as far as the Ponte Molle, where there was a solemn and affectionate farewell, which, as described by the biographers, was not very consistent with the mystery and secrecy sought to be thrown round the mission.

Goldwell and Morton had ridden on before; our pilgrims

followed on foot. Parsons managed every thing. "It was thought convenient," he writes, "that each priest should change his long apparel, both for better travelling afoot, as also not so easily to be discerned in Germany and some other places of Protestants, where priests are little favoured. And when some new apparel was offered to Campion, he would in no wise take it, but only covered himself with certain old buckram under an old cloak, and passed with that attire throughout his whole journey;" "for he said, that to him that went to be hanged in England any apparel was sufficient." "And to prove the blessed man the more, God sent continual rain for the first eight or ten days after our leaving Rome, so as from morning to night he travelled in the wet with that evil apparel, and oftentimes stuck so fast in the mire in those deep and foul ways that he was scarce able to get out again." There were a few horses among them for the use of the old and sick; but Campion never rode but once, when he was suffering from ague and diarrhœa. It was ordered also that every man should take a new name, to escape the chance spies by the way, who would discover each man in particular to the Council. They wanted to call Campion Petre; but he, remembering how well he had escaped from Ireland under St. Patrick's patronage, would take no other name but his old one of Patrick. "Albeit," says Parsons, "when we came to St. Omer's, and were to enter into England, we persuaded him to take some other English name, lest the other, being Irish, might bring him in question; for Ireland at that time was noised to be in trouble by the arrival of Dr. Sanders with some soldiers from the Pope for the assistance of certain Catholic noblemen in arms for their religion, as they said."

It was Campion's custom on this journey to say Mass very early every morning, and then, after reciting the *Itinerarium* with the rest, to push on about a mile ahead of the company, to meditate for a few hours, read his breviary, and recite the litanies of the saints, when he would lag to allow the party to catch him up, and would joke and chatter with them till it was time to push forward again for his evening meditation and prayer. At Bologna they were obliged to stay some days, by an accident to Parsons' leg. They had brought a letter from Agazzari, the Rector of the English College, to Cardinal Paleotto, the Archbishop, who received them hospitably. This prelate enforced a monastic discipline in his palace. At dinner, after the usual reading, questions were proposed, and discussion often passed into discourse. Campion and Sherwin were both encouraged to speak.



"Campion's discourse," says Parsons, "was very pithy, and fit for the place and time. He began with Cicero's quotation from Pythagoras, who, perceiving by the light of nature man's difficulty to good, and proneness to vice, said, that the way of virtue was hard and laborious, but yet not void of delectation, and much more to be embraced than the other, which was easy. Which Father Campion applying to a Christian life, showed very aptly both the labours and delights thereof, and that the saying of Pythagoras was much more verifiable in the same than in the life of any heathen philosopher, for that the labours were greater, the helps more potent, the end more high, and the reward more excellent. Whereby also in fine he came to declare the nature and quality of the journey and enterprise which his fellows had in hand, and greatly to encourage them in the same." The rest at Bologna gave Campion time to write to one of his friends at Prague. Here is a translation of his letter :

"This is an answer to your two letters, one of which I received as I was leaving Munich, the other when I had reached Rome. What you tell me for my salvation, I accept as the command of God. Only do not think that your care of me is ended while I live. You must not wonder that when I wrote from Munich I did not say a word about your letter, for it was delivered to me after I had folded mine, and had left it with the Rector of the College. I see you had not read it even when you wrote your second letter to me; you must therefore speak to Father Ferdinand, and give him my dutiful salutation. With respect to the *Ambrosian* (his tragedy) which you ask me about in your other letter, you must know, my Father, that it was not given back to me after your return from Vienna; but that I saw it in your chamber, where I doubt not but it still lies in some corner, unless it is in somebody's hands, who borrowed it of you when you were engaged, so that you have forgotten about it. If it is acted again, I pray you let it be made more comprehensible. I submit it to the censure of a practised man, such as Father Nicholas; I remembered him in the Holy House at Loreto, and I read the poem which he hung up. I accept with joy Father Urban's bargain; I expected nothing so little as a letter from him, whom in my journey I had often recommended to God as dead; now at last I learn there was a mistake in the person, on account of his having the same name as the one who lately died at Fulda. So I am excessively glad that such a pious agreement exists between Father Ziphelin and me. I have a similar agreement with Fathers Aquensis, Gabriel, Stephen of Dalmatia, and Troger, jointly and severally. Now they can be of great service to me in the midst of my infinite perils. I am now at Bologna, on my return from Rome, and on the way to my warfare in England. Whatever becomes of me, our posterity

survives. You would hardly believe me if I told you what comfort I feel when I think of them. If they were not Englishmen I would say more about them. In this expedition there are two Fathers of the Society, Robert Parsons and myself, seven other priests, and three laymen, one of whom is also of us. I see them all so prodigal of blood and life, that I am ashamed of my backwardness. I hope to be with Allen, at Rheims, in the beginning of June. We all travel at the Pope's cost. Though we should fall at the first onset, yet our army is full of fresh recruits, by whose victory our ghosts will be pacified. But let us come ὑστερον πρότερον to the journey to Rome. I drove in the carriage of Prince Ferdinand as far as Innsbruck, thence I walked to Padua. There, as I was about to bestow what money I had left, according to your directions, I was suddenly told to make haste to Rome. We mounted our horses, for I had stumbled on another Father by the way. Though I had so much money left at first, yet in a few days I should have had nothing to pay my bills, except my companion had had plenty. I made use of God's providence, and your liberality, as you told me. Indeed I was liberal enough to spend more than the whole. At Padua I was shown about by young Matthias Melchiorius, who scarcely left my side; he has the best dispositions towards the Society, and is of excellent report. Here I am reminded of my pupils, and of our companions, whom I often think of. There are so many to whom I wished to write severally, and I was so overwhelmed with their number and with my other business, that I have hitherto written to none of them. I am tired when I reach our colleges; in the inns I can scarcely breathe. I was at Rome about eight days, cramped for time, more than during all the rest of my journey. I must ask them therefore, and especially my fathers and brothers of Prague, to pardon what I cannot help. The rest I reserve for a fourth letter. I shall be very glad if I find one from you before I pass over into England. You may send to Rheims, Paris, or Douai, for I suppose that I shall visit these places. But, anyhow, if they are sent to Allen, they will be delivered to me. In uncertainty whether we shall ever see one another again, I write my will, and I leave to you and all of them the kiss of charity and the bond of peace. Farewell. Bologna, the last of April, 1580.

Reverend Father, again and again, and for ever, farewell."

Before leaving Rome, our pilgrims had doubtless originated the custom of the English missionaries going to St. Philip Neri, ere they set out for the scene of their passion, that the full zeal and love pent up in that burning breast might find a vent and flow over from him who was kept at home upon those who were to face the foe. "Therefore," says Dr. Newman, "one by one, each in his turn, those youthful soldiers came to the old man, and one by one they persevered and gained the crown and the palm—all but one, who had not gone and would not go for the salutary blessing." I don't



know whether John Pascal was in this case; he, I think, was the only one of this company that fell. He was a layman, a great favourite of the Pope, an agreeable companion, and a pupil of Sherwin; after his fall it was remembered of him that he had shown great defect of character in his behaviour to the Pope, whose generosity and kindness he received with too great familiarity. Bombinus says this was pride,—“for the same arrogance which covets distinctions above one’s sphere, makes light of them when gained.” Johnson, perhaps, would have called it servility, one of the basest features of which is to suffer one’s liberty in the presence of great men to aggrandise him in his own esteem: a favourite may be saucy; but he is saucy only because he is servile.

They had left one Saint at Rome, they were to find another at Milan. St. Charles Borromeo received our pilgrims into his house, and kept them there for eight days. He made Sherwin preach before him, and he made Campion discourse every day after dinner. “He had,” says Parsons, “sundry learned and most godly speeches with us, tending to the contempt of this world, and perfect zeal of Christ’s service, whereof we saw so rare an example in himself and his austere and laborious life; being nothing in effect but skin and bone, through continual pains, fasting, and penance; so that without saying a word, he preached to us sufficiently, and we departed from him greatly edified and exceedingly animated.” St. Charles always showed a partiality for the English exiles. Owen Lewis, the Bishop of Cassano, had been his vicar-general, and William Giffard, afterwards Archbishop of Rheims, his chaplain. After our pilgrims’ visit he wrote to Agazzari, the president: “I saw and willingly received those English who departed hence the other day, as their goodness deserved, and the cause for which they had undertaken that voyage. If, in future, your Reverence shall send any others to me, be assured that I will take care to receive them with all charity, and that it will be most pleasing to me to have occasion to perform the duties of hospitality, so proper for a Bishop, towards the Catholics of that nation. Milan, the last of June, 1580.”

From Milan our party went to Turin, and entered the Alps at Mount Cenis, “all in health, and apt for travel,” and after sundry long marches, arrived at St. Jean de Maurienne, in Savoy, where they encountered many troops of Spanish soldiers, who were marching from Flanders to Milan, on occasion of the truce between Don John of Austria and the States-General of Holland. Our priests were thereby somewhat distressed for necessary lodging and provision for man and horse. At Aiguebelle they met with another “*rout*” of the

army, and learned besides that the road by Lyons was blocked up and imperilled by the insurrection of the peasants of Dauphiné; and so, after deliberation, they resolved to pass by Geneva in spite of the difficulties that might arise from the difference in religion; for it was a free city, and the laws of the Swiss cantons permitted travellers, whether Catholics or not, to pass that way, and stay for three days, which was a longer delay than they meant to make. Most of the company also desired to see Theodore Beza, of whom they had heard so much in England, where his fame was greater than in any other Calvinist country, much greater than it was then in Geneva itself. Some of them jested merrily at the suggestion that perhaps the magistrates of the city, who were in confederacy with Elizabeth, might detain them, or send them prisoners to England, by way of the Rhine, at the instance of Beza or the English residents. But they concluded, that if God would have them taken, He would find means; and to them it was all one whether they were captured in Geneva or in England.

There remained yet another little consultation, whether they should confess to the magistrates what religion they professed, and whither they were bound, or only tell them as much as they were obliged; but it was quickly resolved unanimously to declare clearly that they were Catholics, and to begin their confession in the city where the sect of Calvin was first hatched. Nevertheless, before they arrived near that "sink of heresy" every man disguised himself, and Campion "dissembled his personage in form of a poor Irishman, and waited on Mr. Pascal," the mere remembrance of how naturally he played his part being a continual source of merriment to Sherwin. Thus disfigured they came to the gates of Geneva; Campion and Sherwin were two of the first to enter; the soldiers, who were keeping great watch and ward for fear of the Spanish bands passing through the country, asked whence they were, and whither they went; after answer was made, the captain told one of his men to conduct them to be examined by the magistrates, who were in session with certain ministers in the open market-place. They were again asked whence they came, and whither they travelled, and why they passed not the ordinary way. They replied: "To avoid the Spaniards, and the 'Dolphinates' who were up in arms." Then they were asked what countrymen they were,— "Some English, some brought up in Ireland," was the reply; and Campion was introduced as Mr. Patrick. "Are you of our religion?" "No," said Pascal. "From the first to the last of us we are all Catholics," said Bruscoe boldly. "So are we



too," said the magistrates. "Yea, but," said Sherwin, who only now came up, "we are all Roman Catholics." "Of that we marvel," said the magistrates, "for your Queen and all her realm are of our religion." "As for our Queen," answered one,—Parsons does not remember whether it was Campion,— "we cannot tell whether she is of your religion or no, considering the variety of opinions that this age has brought forth; but sure we are she is not of ours. Though for the realm, you must understand that all are not of her religion, nor of yours; but many be good Christian Catholics, and do suffer both losses at home and banishment abroad for the same, of which number are we, who have lived divers years in Italy, and are going now towards the English Seminary in Rheims, but are obliged to pass by Geneva to avoid the Spanish soldiers and Dauphinese insurgents." Then the magistrates promised them free and courteous entertainment according to the laws of the country; and seeing them all so resolute, they questioned them no more about religion, but only about the Spaniards, of whom they could give but very small advices. So a soldier was ordered to guide them to their inn, a very fair one, bearing the sign of the city, and willed that they should be very well used for their money—as they were. This was about 11 o'clock in the forenoon. As they were being examined, they saw the long-bearded ministers of Geneva looking at them from the windows and laughing. "But if we might have had our wills," says Sherwin, "we would have made them to have wept Irish." As they were passing through the streets of the city, some one said, "They are all priests;" others, "They are all monks;" and one, seeing Campion dressed like a servant, thought either to discover him or to chaff him, by asking in Latin, "*Cujas es?*" ("Whose man are you?") Campion had his wits about him, and answered sharply, "Signor, no!" The fellow was taken aback, and asked, "*Potesne loqui latine?*" no doubt mistaking the Italian for Latin; and Campion answered with "a shrink with his shoulder, and so staked off the knave."

After dinner, forthwith, Father Parsons, Pascal, with his man Patrick dressed in an old suit of black buckram, Sherwin, Rishton, and Kirby, sallied forth to visit Beza, and, if possible, to have some speech with him, either about the Catholic religion, or about the controversy between the Protestants and Puritans, as he was reckoned one of the chief writers in it. When they knocked at the door, his wife Candida,\* of whom

\* In his edition of his poems, Geneva, 1569, he denies that the Candida whom he celebrates was meant for Claudine, the tailor's wife of the Rue de la

they had read so much, and who had been the tailor's wife at Paris, came and opened the door, and let them into a little court, where she told them to stay, as Monsieur Beza was busy in his study, and would come forth to them, which it seems he did with the worse will, as he had been informed about them by the magistrates. However, when he came forth in his long black gown and round cap, with ruffs about his neck, and his fair long beard, he saluted them courteously, but did not invite them into his house, or to sit down, but remained on foot, and asked them what they would have. They told him, that being scholars, and passing by Geneva, they could do no less than come to see him, for the fame that they had heard in England of his name: he answered, that he understood it was far greater than he deserved; that he loved all Englishmen heartily, but was sorry to hear his visitors were not of the religion of their country. They answered that their country was large, and held more sorts than one; that they kept to the religion to which it was first converted from paganism, but if he could show more weighty reasons to the contrary than they had yet heard or read, they would be content to hear him. Father Parsons then asked how his Church was governed, and he replied, "By equality in the ministry: there are nine of us, and every one rules his week." Then it was said that the English had Bishops, and that the Queen was the head without any interruption; he answered "shamefully" that he did not know it to be so, and after some shuffling declared that he did not approve of it; however, he said, the difference is one of discipline only, not of doctrine; but he could not proceed with the dispute, which would take more time than he could spare, for he was busy, having just received some packets of letters from France about the Duke of Guise and his practices against the professors of the Gospel, of which he told tales that they afterwards found quite untrue; and thus drew aside the talk from religion to other subjects, and with this would have broken off. But Campion (who in his serving-man's attire had all the while stood waiting with hat in hand "facing out the old doting heretical fool," says Sherwin) was unwilling to let him escape thus, and broke forth: "Sir, though I perceive you are much occupied and would be gone, I pray you let me ask but this question: How do you say that the Queen of England and you be of one religion, seeing that you defend the religion of the Puritans, which she so much abhorreth and persecuteth?" Beza replied, with a slight shrug, "I know not what 'Puri-

Calandre, at Paris, who eloped with him to Geneva when he fled from the Parliament of Paris, and whom he afterwards married.



tan' means. The difference you speak of is none at all in fact." On this Campion offered to prove that the differences were very important, and many, and essential, even on such points as the Sacraments. Beza, fearing from this exordium a long controversy, made a sign to his wife, who interposed with another packet of letters; on which he said that he could stay no longer, and courteously took leave of them, promising to send to their inn to visit them an English scholar of his, the son and heir of Sir-George Hastings, and next of kin to the Earl of Huntingdon, the Puritan president of the north. The youth, however, never came, but instead there came his governor, Mr. Brown, very fervent in the religion of Geneva, and with him Mr. Powell, a Protestant, but a very civil gentleman, a young man of good parts, son of one of the six clerks in Chancery, and M.A. of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he had been acquainted with Campion, and familiar with Parsons and Sherwin; there came also three or four Englishmen more. Campion was absent when they came, and as he was in such strange attire, it was thought advisable not to let them see him. So Parsons and the rest walked about the town with them, and had much familiar speech, which ended in an invitation to supper; however, Powell and the rest would not sup with them, but promised to come afterwards. When they came, Parsons took Powell in hand, and Sherwin, Kirby, and Rishton attacked Brown, with whom they hotly disputed in the streets of Geneva almost till midnight, sending to Beza through him a challenge to a public controversy on any disputed point, with this condition, that he that was justly convicted in the opinion of indifferent judges should be burnt alive in the market-place. Brown promised to convey the message; "but God knoweth," says Sherwin, "that he durst not perform it, nor show himself to us any more." Powell, on hearing what had happened, told Parsons that he knew the place well, and was sure that if Brown told Beza or the magistrates of the challenge it might bring them into trouble; they were within the municipal jurisdiction, and a reason might easily be found for detaining them beyond the three days allowed them by law, in which case it would be hard to get any remedy. Parsons profited by this sage and friendly advice, and made peace for that night, resolving to leave the town early the next morning. Powell offered to accompany them, but he was asked not to bring the Puritan schoolmaster.

Early the next morning Powell came again and breakfasted with them, using them lovingly, and brought them out of the town on their way. All this while Campion

had played the serving-man, and not wishing to be recognised by Powell, he and Bruscoe were sent forward by themselves. On the top of a hill, about a mile out of Geneva, on the road towards France, they met one of the great ministers of Geneva, who seemed to be conning a sermon without book. Campion straightway buckled with him, and asked, "How his Church was governed?" The minister, who supposed Campion, as an Englishman, to be Protestant, explained that it was governed by nine ministers in their turns. "Then who is the chief head of it?" asked Campion. "Christ," said the other. "But has it no one certain supreme head or governor upon earth under Christ?" "It needeth none." "Why, then," said Campion, "how can you hold the religion of the Queen of England to be true, when she calls herself head and supreme governor of the Church?" "She doth not call herself so," said the minister. "Yes, but she doth," said Campion; "and he that shall deny her supremacy in causes ecclesiastical in England must suffer death for it, for it is treason by statute." The minister, in a great chafe,— "almost mad"—was going to deny again, when Campion, seeing Powell and the rest approach, left him suddenly; Parsons and Sherwin came up to the man, who seemed in desperation, and told them that there was a fellow beyond who held a strange opinion, and had mocked him about his Church; upon which the whole company "fell upon him, and shook up the poor shakerell before the soldiers in the gate." Campion looked back and saw that the dispute was renewed; so, fearing misrepresentation, he went back to tell what had been controverted, on which Parsons and Powell, who was acquainted with the minister, said that it was undeniable that the Queen was taken for head of the Church, and that the first-fruits of all benefices were paid to her, and that Parliament had transferred all the Pope's jurisdiction in England to her. The preacher then suggested: "It may be she calleth herself supreme head of the Church *quia Regina est Christiana*." "Ergo," said Campion, "much more is the King of France head of the Church, because he is called *Rex Christianissimus*." "Nay," said the minister, "I mean *Catholica Christiana*." "Ergo," quoth Campion, "much more the King of Spain, whose title is *Rex Catholicus*." The minister was furious, and declared that Campion was no Englishman but a very Papist. But Powell, who had recognised Campion, and saluted him with much affection, quieted the preacher and sent him off, and walked on a mile or more with them, promising to study Catholic books and to visit Rome, and then returned; but they looked back from the top of a hill



upon the miserable city, and said a *Te Deum* for their escape from it; and for penance for their curiosity the whole company made a pilgrimage to St. Clodoveus, in France, about eight or nine miles off, over difficult paths, and afterwards went stoutly on their journey till Whit Monday, when eight of them fell sick in one night; so they had to travel to Rheims by short stages, and all but Kemp reached that city the last day of May, having spent nearly six weeks on the journey.

---

## Correspondence.

### THE PUGIN TESTIMONIAL.

SIR,—The recent appearance of Mr. Ferrey's *Recollections of A. N. Welby Pugin* suggests an opportunity for reminding Catholics of what, in the press of graver interests, they may possibly have forgotten,—the testimonial which is in course of being raised to do honour to the memory of that great and good man.

Opinions may vary indefinitely as to the relative merits and conveniences of different kinds of ecclesiastical architecture, or, again, as to Pugin's success in that style which he had made peculiarly his own. I am no bigoted and exclusive devotee of Gothic, and am quite ready to believe that there was something of narrowness and servile copyism in Pugin's treatment of it as compared with the developments it has subsequently received at the hands of Mr. Scott and other living masters of the art. But it must never be forgotten that a man who came forward single-handed to indicate the true principles of Christian art at a time when the fashionable ideals of church-building oscillated between a kind of stunted theatre and what looked like an overgrown summer-house, has established a lasting claim on the gratitude and respect of all lovers of correct taste, and all who regard the external accessories of reverence as a help and not a hindrance of true devotion. His famous *Contrasts* may have lost their interest now, but it is because their work is done. Others may have excelled him in originality of conception, and in power of elasticity in adapting the principles of mediæval art to the exigencies of modern ritual and modern society; but they have been able to profit by the errors no less than by the experience of the last thirty years. It is seldom given to the genius which creates—and Pugin was truly a genius—to bring its own creations to perfection. And it is also fair to remember that he had seldom the opportunity of even doing justice to himself. The excessive and disproportionate ornamentation of Cheadle Church is partly to be explained by a change in the scale of expenditure announced by its founder when the work was already in progress;

and if St. George's Cathedral—his second *chef-d'œuvre*—is in some respects a conspicuous failure, our criticism is disarmed, though our regret is not diminished, by considering that the architect was hampered by the supervision of a vexatious committee, and the still more serious drawback of inadequate funds. After all deductions, it remains certain that he did a work by which his name will live, and which leaves a lasting impress on the architecture of his country.

But it is not only as an architect that Pugin claims our honour. He was one of the noble few who are nature's heroes, marked out as such by the generous courage, the outspoken candour, and the uncompromising self-devotion to whatever appeared to him bound up with the interests of truth, which were his characteristics through life. In word and deed he was essentially the reverse of being a sham; there was nothing little, or mean, or narrow about him. Such men do not turn up every day, and deserve to be recognised and honoured when they do.

On us, as Catholics, his memory has a further claim. We cannot forget that, almost before the first whispers were heard of that movement which has convulsed the Anglican Communion, and sent so many converts to the Church, at a period when Popery and Paganism were almost synonymous terms in the minds of Englishmen, Pugin came forward, reckless of consequences, and at the cost of associations to him peculiarly dear, to offer an unpopular homage to conscientious convictions in the acceptance of Catholic truth. The idea of the present testimonial did not indeed, I believe, originate among ourselves. It is not a religious but a national tribute to the memory of one of whose genius and character the nation may well be proud. But that is no reason why we should not join our fellow-countrymen in the graceful expression of a sentiment which we have indeed every reason for sharing with them, but which also comes home to us with a force peculiar to ourselves. Let me add, that in asking a place in the *Rambler* for these few lines in memory of Pugin, I feel that I am making a request not inconsistent with the character of a Journal so honourably distinguished among us by its hearty and discriminating recognition of moral and intellectual eminence.

Your obedient servant,

JUSTITIA.

---

#### RECOLLECTIONS OF PUGIN.

SIR,—I should think that you would be unwilling to renew the controversy between your Review and Mr. Pugin, which seemed altogether stilled by the death of that great architect. There seems to be no such unwillingness on the side of Mr. Purcell, who has contributed the Catholic part to Mr. Ferrey's recent volume of *Recollections of Pugin*. He tells how Pugin was the chief object of the



attacks of a clique of writers, whose chief organ was the *Rambler*, whom he taxed with harbouring Genevan tendencies, and indulging in methodistical cant. Pugin denounces, says Mr. Purcell, the dangerous innovations and discontented spirit which he discovers lurking in the pages of the *Rambler*, and foretells, with an almost prophetic keenness of vision, that sooner or later its writers (probably quite different people from the present staff) will gravely offend against Catholic judgment, and wound in its dearest interests Catholic instinct. After this, Mr. Purcell has to defend his friend against the charges of looking upon the Anglican Establishment as a branch of the true Church, and of recognising her orders as valid, and to praise him for "rising superior to the weakness, too common among Catholics of the present day, of seeking to hide from the contemptuous or hostile gaze of the world the blotches and sores that from time to time burst forth and deface the divine beauty of the Church of God." But I do not think Mr. Purcell's insinuations to be worth a retort, so I will crave your permission to offer a few recollections of Pugin which may serve to fill up some gaps, and to explain the reasons of his differences with the *Rambler* of his day more fully than Mr. Ferrey or Mr. Purcell have thought necessary to do.

I met Pugin for the first time at Rome, in 1847. Though he found scarcely any thing to interest him in the Eternal City, his activity was as energetic there as any where else. Under the guidance of various friends, he visited church after church, disgusted with all, but solacing himself occasionally with fragments of mediæval work, especially with the incised grave-stones which exhibited the same outlines of ecclesiastical vestments as he had adopted. "Ah," said he, "they must have had fine things at one time."

There were, however, a few exceptions to his general disgust. I took him to the Basilica of St. Mark, where there is a double chancel, one rather lower than the nave, the other built over it on arches, and reached by a flight of steps on each side. Pugin admired it much, declared it was well worth coming all the way from England to Rome to see, and took out his sketch-book, pencil, and rule, and at once proceeded to transfer, not St. Mark's, but a variation of it, to his tablets. Under his rapid pencil all the arches became pointed, the classic shafts became clustered piers, the painted apse became a Gothic semi-octagon with tall lights, and St. Mark's came out in Gothic raiment.

I went with him to St. Peter's. He was violent in his condemnation of the whole thing. Nothing satisfied him. It was the upas-tree of Christendom; it was the pagan model to which Bishops and princes came from the countries of pointed architecture, and from which they carried memorials and drawings of the hideous altars, to be substituted at a vast expense for the magnificent remains of real Christian art, which would still have been left if it had not been for the foolish Romaniſing of travelling prelates. Thus St. Peter's had spoiled half the fine old buildings of Christendom. I was contented that he should quarrel with the nave, with its plaster pilasters,

its stable windows, and Daniel-Lambert piers ; but when he pronounced the dome to be a humbug, a failure, an abortion, a mass of imposition, and a sham, constructed even more vilely than it was designed, I must confess that I was somewhat taken aback. I suspected that his violence covered a void that he was desirous to conceal, and that his prejudices arose, not from any exuberance of study and knowledge, but from sheer ignorance and want of depth. I suspected that he was accustomed to elevate accidental and partial developments into fundamental and universal principles ; that he had drawn his own canons of taste only from that which *he* had always seen and known, and which had become familiar to him ; and that he had sworn a great oath to impose these canons of taste upon every body else, without any regard for what *they* had always seen and known, and had become familiar with,—as if an Eastern despot, having found pleasure in eating sugar and oysters for breakfast, were to issue his *hât* that all his subjects, without any gastronomical distinctions, should also eat sugar and oysters for breakfast, and should like the mixture, under pain of the bow-string. Of the same kind was his decision in favour of English Gothic, in comparison with the French, German, or Italian varieties. Such, too, as I discovered, was his dislike of domes.

As we were leaving St. Peter's, half-way down the nave I turned and called Pugin's attention to the extraordinary effect of the sunbeams traversing the dome, and half-concealing the presbytery beyond in a mist of glory. For the moment Pugin was quite overcome, and he became nearly as enthusiastic as he had been at St. Mark's. I improved the occasion to show him how glorious a Gothic dome would be, and reminded him how noble an example we had in the lantern of Ely Cathedral, which only wanted a slight development to become a genuine dome. I urged also that the outline of the dome was the Gothic arch, and therefore ought to be more easily absorbed in a Gothic than in a classical outline. When Pugin next called upon me, I showed him some sketches in which I had attempted to adapt English Gothic details to the forms of Florence Cathedral, and of the beautiful little cupola of Santa Maria di Loreto, near Trajan's column. Pugin seemed at first taken with the idea, was kind enough to praise one or two of my details, and took up my pencil to make a kind of cloudy outline of a central dome, flanked by four towers, with nave, choir, and transepts, which he said would be very fine. But in a moment or two he seemed to change his mind. He said that my adaptation was a baptistry, and not a cathedral. I then described the Duomo of Florence to him. He had not then seen it, for he came to Rome by Marseilles and Civita Vecchia, having on his way visited Avignon, with which he was specially delighted ; the Papal Palace, he said, was more like a production of nature than of art, it seemed to grow out of the rock, and was pretty nearly as massive as if it had been a spur of the Alps ; his sketch-book was full of beautiful drawings ; perhaps the contrast of Avignon and Rome was an element in the disap-



pointment he felt ;—but to resume. He still objected to the massive piers which would be necessary to support such a dome, and which were quite contrary to the intercolumnary principle of Gothic architecture. I asked why he thought the usual division into nave and aisles, separated by moderate columns, to be fundamentally necessary in a Gothic church. He replied, that the chief reason was, that the congregation might be concentrated in the nave, while the aisles were kept clear for processions. I suggested that processions might walk just as well in an undivided hall, for room might be kept for them on the floor. He made out in reply, that a procession was of no good unless it played bo-peep among the pillars, appearing and reappearing in the intercolumniations, like an army marching through a wood. I had heard that he had once asked Father Ignatius, who, after giving benediction in some chapel in a French cope, had met Pugin in the sacristy, and had begged him to join in the crusade of prayers for the conversion of England, “Why, what’s the use of praying for England in such a cope as that?” so I was not surprised at his selection of the feature of a procession in which he supposed its virtue to reside, and I accordingly held my peace. I afterwards found that Pugin’s taste on this point went on the principle that the great charm of Gothic ornamentation is to conceal its charms, to hide one rich feature behind another of equal richness, even to the extent of blending all in one glare of gold and pomp. I remember on one occasion suggesting to him that a stone canopy for the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament at Benediction ought to be painted with some colours which might contrast with the gold of the remonstrance, so as to enable persons at the other end of the church to see whether it was under the canopy or not. Pugin entirely dissented from my view, and asserted that the object of decoration was not to show distinctly, but to blend every thing in a blaze of splendour and mystery. Mr. Purcell tells us how Pugin detested the “all-seeing” principle of the *Rambler*, which would convert our churches into show-rooms, barren and bare as barns, and hideous to look upon as shambles ; which only looks upon ceremonies as spectacles, and which therefore ought to build churches upon the model of theatres. Pugin seems to have held that ceremonies should only be half seen. He objected to the solid Greek screens and to the massive piers of the nave of St. Peter’s, because they would entirely hide all processions and ceremonies ; he considered Gothic piers and open screens to be the just mean, because they only half hid what went on behind them. The “all-seeing” principle was to govern secular theatres ; the “half-seeing” principle was that of the spiritual theatres, or churches. But to revert to our domes.

He was hardly satisfied with the result of our talk ; for when I met him a year afterwards in England, he told me that he had held a long argument on the subject with Sir Charles Barry, and that at last they had both come to the conclusion that the dome was at variance with the fundamental principles of Gothic architecture, and that the

central dome between the two Houses of Parliament was an abominable failure. At the same time he praised the Victoria Tower as the finest existing building in the style ; chiefly, I think, because it was the biggest.

At Rome, also, I took Pugin to Overbeck's studio ; and as he expressed a desire to have some conversation with the great artist, I invited them to meet at my rooms in the evening. Pugin spoke French like a Frenchman. Overbeck spoke German and Italian fluently, but it was only with difficulty that he could speak, or even understand, French. But Pugin allowed no difficulties to spoil so glorious an opportunity of inculcating his principles on one who might give such great help in spreading them. From the moment Overbeck came into the room he appropriated him, and rattled into his ears a voluble torrent, which had no break, and scarcely allowed Overbeck to get in a word. The artist was much amused, and sat listening with his calm smile ; he afterwards professed to have learned much from the interview, and thanked me for giving him the occasion. Pugin, I remember, was trying to impress upon the painter some of the general principles that he had drawn out in his books. In particular, he was illustrating his axiom, that the great test of architectural and decorative beauty consists in the fitness of the design to the purpose for which it is intended. He was applying this test to the angels painted by Steinle as decorations in the spandrels of the arches of the choir at Cologne Cathedral. Pugin confessed that as angels they were beautiful enough ; as decorations they were failures. All Gothic decoration, he said, should be exuberant ; it should be full measure, pressed down, and running over ; the saint should fill his niche, and more than fill it—he should be too big to be altogether put into it. Some parts of the figure should be concealed behind the tabernacle work, some parts should project beyond. Pugin's active pencil kept forming a running commentary on his precepts, and he sketched for Overbeck how a Gothic niche should be, and how it should not be, filled. Then he returned to Steinle's angels. Their fault was that they did not fill up the spandril. This is how they ought to be, he said, making a sketch, in which he exhibited the angel stretching out one wing to fill up the angle at the point of the arch, and gathering up the other wing so as to adapt it exactly to the right angle formed by the ascending vault-shaft, and the horizontal string-course under the triforium ; while the toes of the angel were awkwardly pointed down, to fill up the acute angle at the spring of the arch. That's how they ought to be, said Pugin, showing with some triumph his angular and conventional deformity, which he had somehow brought himself to regard as ideally beautiful. Overbeck took the sketch, looked at it with a quiet, quizzical smile, then folded it up and pocketed it, while Pugin was plunging into the next point of his discourse. The interview lasted till late at night, when the two artists departed, with strong expressions of delight at having made each other's acquaintance.



Mr. Ferrey is right in saying that Pugin thought it the greatest day of his life when he received a medal from the Pope. As was natural, he interpreted it as meaning more than it did mean; for it was a clear exaggeration to look upon it as an approbation of his exclusive views, and as a condemnation of those ecclesiastics who still preferred Italian "abominations" to Gothic furniture. Still Pius IX. has shown a toleration of Gothic which has been unknown at Rome since the fifteenth century. Till lately there was a municipal regulation which prevented any one putting a Gothic window or door even into his own house, if it looked upon the public street. It was too great an eyesore, too *tedesco*, too *trito*, for tastes formed by Bernini's graven images, fluttering and frowning in their histrionic brass. But Pius IX. has not only permitted a Gothic chapel to be fitted up in the Vatican, he has also caused the only Gothic church in Rome, the Minerva, to be restored in its original style. Pugin mistook the wide toleration of that large heart for all mere matters of taste, and the earnest approval and benediction which it had for all well-intentioned efforts directed towards the good of religion for a distinct approbation of the side he took in the Gothic controversy, and a distinct condemnation of his opponents. It is quite needless to say that this was merely his fancy. Pugin's gratification was all the more intense as it was unexpected. He was so annoyed with Rome, that he contemplated leaving it without seeing the Pope. I think it was Mgr. Talbot who prevented this unseemly step, by procuring an audience for the celebrated architect, the reviver of Gothic churches, and almost of ecclesiastical ceremonial, in England. This honour plunged Pugin into new and somewhat comical difficulties. Mr. Ferrey describes with some vexation Pugin's slovenliness in dress. His eccentricity in this respect was more marked on his travels than at home. He had arrived in Rome with the very minimum of luggage, and his artistic implements filled so much of his hand-bag that there was no room for a change even of his linen. His manner on his journey had been to wear whatever he had on as perseveringly as a Capuchin wears his habit, till he judged it to be unfit for further use, when, without troubling the washerwoman, he would buy a new garment, and leave the old one as a legacy to the chambermaid. The etiquette of Rome is not very stringent, but the forms of the Court would hardly admit of Pugin paying his respects to the Pope in the rough sailor's garb that he wore on his travels: he had, therefore, to rig himself out in borrowed garments; and I have never ceased to wonder how he thrust his brawny arms through the sleeves of my coat, or drew it round his broad shoulders without bursting the seams. On his return from the Quirinal he spoke in most affectionate terms of the Holy Father, in whom he had found all the dignity, all the saintliness, and all the paternal familiarity that his imagination required; but he never ceased lamenting the meanness of the chamber where he sat, and of the scanty furniture which garnished it. He wished that he could have the furnishing of the audience-room. For his fancy had at once supplied him with a design full of scenic

effects :—the Pope in the distance, seated under a Gothic canopy, shining in gold and purple, and surrounded with holy images, and all the sacred emblems of religion; the steps of the throne guarded by a balustrade of kneeling monks with flowing draperies, while prelates in Gothic copes stood round the Chair of Peter; an avenue of Swiss and halberdiers, in mediæval costume, guarding the way up the throne, along which the persons to be presented were to make their three solemn prostrations; while the Pope above them, amid swinging censers and clouds of incense, was to cast his benediction upon them, and to receive them with outstretched arms to the kissing of his foot. For Pugin's mind could never emancipate itself from its slavery to theatrical effect; and amongst the shams and impositions which he denounced with such precipitate simplicity, he never once suspected that the made-up solemnities of histrionic functions could deserve to be classed.

I think that Pugin was never very consistent in the application of his principles. He never seemed to know whether to derive styles of architecture from the symbols of religion, or from the constructive necessity of the materials first used. The latter idea, which was really important and prolific, was often overlaid and distorted by the former. He did not see that symbolism is conventional, and that any signs might in time come to have any meaning. Architecture first existed, and then assumed a meaning. His rage at Michael Angelo's "Last Judgment" was quite comical. Seriously he thought that any representation of a naked figure (he had never seen the catacombs) was quite irreconcilable with Christian symbolism. The garments signified the grace of God, sanctity, and so forth; and to represent a saint without them was a simple profanation. I said, not without the intention of provoking him, that there might be another way of looking at it; as Adam and Eve were naked before they fell, nudity might be a good symbol of the state of paradisaic innocence regained by the saints. "Why, my dear sir, you are a preadamite heretic," he shouted; and then turning to some one standing near—"Here is a preadamite heretic," he said; and followed up his denunciation with a whimsical perversion of the argument I had used to him. I do not know that he was more serious when he called the *Rambler* heretical or methodistical. He felt strongly, but not so strongly as he expressed himself; and his disciples should not take all his exaggerations as gospel.

I will conclude by offering a few remarks on Pugin's place as an architect. Neither his works nor his ideas should I estimate so highly as Mr. Ferrey. His merit was to be the pioneer of a revival, to recommend new principles, and to expose the utter hollowness and want of principle in the architecture generally prevailing. He was just the man for this work. But when he turned from precept to practice, his incompleteness at once became manifest. In the first place, he could no more design a figure than Mr. Bell can design a pedestal. The way in which he reduced the human form, the perfection of natural beauty, to a mere angular filling-up of the vacant



spaces of his panelling, was simply grotesque. In his architecture, also, he carried out his vertical principle, which in his eyes was the emblem of the resurrection, to an absurd length ; and his buildings and drawings always want that repose and grandeur which the due development of horizontal lines can alone give. Then he wanted the taste to appreciate any architecture but the English Gothic, or rather his principles drove him to say that he wanted the taste ; for twice I have caught him, in moments of enthusiasm, charmed with Italian buildings ; but during those very days he could write, " Italian architecture is a mere system of veneering marble slabs." I wonder what he would have said to the Italianisms and marble veneers of the exquisite little chapel of the Blessed Sacrament at Chelsea.

To his geniality no compliment would be exaggerated ; he was a prince of good companionship. And for the solid character of his charity, I cannot help quoting in conclusion a page out of Mr. Ferrey's " Recollections."

" In his generosity he spared neither money nor personal exertion, and relieved all, without distinction of country or religion. For this end he had in his hall a chest filled with entire suits of clothes ; and one of his greatest pleasures in life was to send away clothed and fed those who came to him ragged and hungry. His active benevolence originated the Sailor's Infirmary at Ramsgate, the embryo of which was to be found in two small houses he hired in King Street, where he engaged nurses to attend the fever-stricken sailors who were left destitute in port.

. . . . " Visiting one Sunday afternoon the captain of his lugger, who had sprained his leg, and finding him destitute of what he considered necessary for his comfort, he at once returned home, and finding no man about the place, he sallied forth, to the astonishment of all who met him, with a mattress, blankets, &c. upon his shoulder, and a bag of provisions in his hand, for the use and comfort of the damaged sailor.

" On another occasion, when two hundred German emigrants were detained in port by stress of weather, this thoughtful and kind-hearted friend of the friendless not only attended to their corporeal wants, but at his own expense invited the priest from the German chapel in London to come down and look after their spiritual necessities. . . . .

" While living at Ramsgate, his love for cruising was easily gratified ; yet he did not sail for pleasure only, but was always ready in the roughest weather to put out to sea and aid in the rescue of crews whose vessels were cast upon the Goodwin Sands."

For a character like his, even those who do not consider him to have been a complete artist may perhaps be allowed to profess their love and veneration, without too much offence to enthusiastic admirers like Mr. Purcell, who confuses his artistic excellencies with his personal qualities, and judges of the beauty of his buildings by the secret motives and intentions of his heart. Pugin's life must be considered in many aspects, and his geniality and his religion must

be marked off from his artistic genius before the latter can be rightly valued.

Your obedient servant,

S.

### **Literary Notices.**

*La Beata.* By T. A. Trollope. An Italian story of seduction and desertion rather prettily told, but which would scarcely deserve popularity out of Exeter-Hall circles (in which hatred to Rome may be said to cover a multitude of sins), but for some vivid descriptions of Florentine customs and scenery, and an evident familiarity with such forms of its society as might be expected to gather round an English resident with strong anti-Catholic prejudices. The author of *La Beata* should be an excellent judge of the measure of success attainable by a dextrous use of the prejudices and foibles of the respectable, religious, and moneyed class of the community in England, and therefore peculiarly well adapted to detect and expose such devices as trading on the opinions of powerful majorities usually involve. There can be little doubt that the bitter Protestantism of Mr. Trollope must *pay* far better in rich England than right-minded adherence to the Church and State of Tuscany, in the days when such things existed, could have prospered the artist-hero of Mr. Trollope's story. Under such circumstances there is something not a little ludicrous in his zeal to convince his readers that it is only Catholics and Italians who make literary, artistic, or business capital out of their religious and political opinions, or, which is a branch of the same art of combining the service of God and Mammon, who offer up their discarded mistresses on the altar of respectability when anxious to make advantageous marriages. Some of the instances which afford Mr. Trollope occasion for specimens of his fiercest power of sarcasm or invective are almost absurdly appropriate to places nearer home,—as, for example, where he is shocked by the indulgent Florentine use of the word “disgrazia.” He has forgotten the precisely similar popular use of the words “misfortune” and “unfortunate” in England.

The excesses to which French novelists have been led by this very road are glaring examples of the evil that results from the dramatic arrangement of questions of casuistry, in which the author can range from sarcasm to argument, from innuendo to appeal, from reason to sympathy, and from sympathy back to reason, with the art of an advocate and the zeal of an amateur, to the perfect contentment of those whose convictions, nationality, prejudices, and circumstances entirely agree with his own. How modern Italians can be content to excite English sympathies at the cost of so much personal contempt is a curious question; and how Englishmen, who



look on almsgiving as degrading, can venture to offer what is really a *moral* alms of so insulting a nature as contemptuous sympathy is still more astonishing.

*History of the First Crusade (Histoire de la Première Croisade).* By J. F. A. Peyré. 2 vols. This is the fullest account of the first Crusade that has appeared in recent times, and if a laborious compilation could supply the place of critical history, it would be one of the best. Unfortunately it is an example of those defects which make the French, who are the best writers of history in the world, the worst possible historians. It is written without passion, and with a very extensive knowledge of the mediæval writers, but absolutely without the least idea of criticism or scientific investigation. The French historians of the last century were addicted to unscrupulous calumny, and those who have succeeded are for the most part afflicted with a contemptuous indifference to the distinction between fact and invention. To the former, the Church and the middle ages were objects of hatred, whilst the historians of the present day generally exhibit admiration and sympathy; yet on the whole there is more to be learnt from those who lied only where passion or interest swayed them than from men who never feel a strong inducement to prefer truth to falsehood. When Deguignes tells us that the Crusaders travelled to Asia in order to obtain wealth and impunity for their crimes, we know what allowance we must make for his opinions, without refusing the credit due to his learning. But when Michaud, who is full of enthusiasm for his subject, tells us that Peter of Amiens appeared at the Council of Clermont, and described the sufferings of the Christians with dejection and consternation in his face, with a voice that was choked by sobs, and an emotion that penetrated every heart, we need only remember that there is no proof that Peter was present at Clermont, in order to be sensible that we are reading a romance, and that neither the author's learning nor his impartiality is a substitute for veracity. The Crusades were extremely unfavourable to historical literature, which degenerated from the close of the eleventh century, and came to be disfigured by an extravagant credulity and imaginativeness, and by all the license which travellers immemorably assume. Modern writers are confounded by the mixture of practical designs with enthusiasm, and very few can distinguish and appreciate the two. From the beginning a poetic and legendary tradition sprang up, which totally distorted the facts and proportions of history, and which soon supplanted the authority of more exact and sober narratives of contemporaries. The most popular myth is that which represents Peter the Hermit as the real author of the movement. This story arose among the lower orders, who formed the army which he led to Anatolia, and invests him with all the merit, to the exclusion of the Pope, and especially of the nobles; and this view took root in Constantinople, for in the narrative of Anna Comnena the Pope disappears altogether. It found its way into later works, and men still write that Peter had a vision in the

Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and came to Europe to rouse the Pope and the nations for its deliverance. The original authorities know nothing of all this. The writers of his own country do not raise him above the level of many other popular preachers, and the contemporary writers of England, Germany, and Italy scarcely mention his name.

The extravagance of such writers partly justifies the contempt with which the Crusades have so commonly been regarded, as a product of unthinking fanaticism, and has long concealed their real character and the profound design which inspired them. Before Jerusalem was taken by the Turks, and before the Greeks had applied for aid, the first outline of the prodigious scheme was traced by Gregory VII., almost immediately after his elevation. It was the Eastern counterpart of the policy by which he was seeking to raise the hierarchy above the states of the West. That policy would be strengthened by the rise in the lost regions of Asia of states where the Church would enjoy political sovereignty, and where the position of the feudal princes would resemble that which it was his object to establish in Europe. It was for this reason that Gregory wished to go himself, that Urban appointed a legate, that the clergy opposed the election of a king of Jerusalem, and that the patriarch was speedily involved in serious quarrels with him. The schism of the East was the second reason which suggested to the Pope the idea of a great expedition. "The Church of Constantinople," he says, "abandoned by the Holy Spirit, has turned away from us, and requires to be reunited with the Apostolic See, whilst great part of the Armenians have abandoned the Catholic faith, and most of the Christians of the East await for St. Peter to decide their disputes." The Grecian emperors had cut off the nations of the West from all intercourse with Asia, and had thus made Constantinople the emporium of all the commerce of the East. The schism made this exclusion a calamity for the Church as well as for the people, and the war with the infidel would necessarily break it down, and the hostility of the Greeks would be silenced by an enterprise which they could but approve. Hence there was as much fear of the sovereignty of the Holy See as mere political ambition in the eagerness with which Alexius exacted homage from the Latin chiefs. It was in accordance with the profoundly practical and statesman-like genius of Gregory VII. that he regarded the conquest of Jerusalem as the reward, not the object, of the expedition. When the Latin arms had established their power on the Bosphorus and in Armenia, Palestine would be securely theirs. Without such a basis, the kingdom of Jerusalem could not stand. Accordingly the wisest princes of the first Crusade abandoned the army on its march, and set up states for themselves at Antioch and Edessa; and later on, St. Lewis reverted to the idea of St. Gregory, and sought to found Frankish states in Africa as bulwarks of the Holy Land. But so lofty a design as that which is sketched in the letters of the great pontiff could not be intelligible to the narrow minds of the people, and his summons produced no effect. Urban II.



had recourse to a more powerful instrument of popular influence. He invoked the religious fervour, the chivalrous enthusiasm of mankind, and with this he succeeded. But the substance of the scheme of Gregory was sacrificed to obtain this support ; for no idea can be popular without some alloy of error to recommend it to the vulgar mind, and this sacrifice was fatal. The Church could not either guide or restrain the enthusiasm she had awakened. St. Bernard discouraged at first the project of the second Crusade. It is better, he told the king of France, to combat our own vices than to fight the Turks; and it was only when Lewis was resolute that the saint roused the empire to assist him, and achieved in the Cathedral of Speyer that marvellous success which surpasses all that the imaginations of men had attributed to the eloquence of Peter the Hermit. But as there was at first more enthusiasm than policy in the Crusaders, so afterwards there was more selfishness than religion ; and the Popes, who had been unable to control the first impulse, were helpless before the reaction. When the Crusades began, the feudal nobility had attained the summit of their power, and it was chiefly through them that the papacy wrought out its ends. They were its auxiliaries against the tyranny of the kings, and its instrument for the deliverance of the East. The Crusades are the spontaneous external action of the Church during the period when her influence was exercised over a military aristocracy. They ended when the political authority of the Church, and the chivalrous society on which it stood, declined before the rise of absolute monarchy and of commercial republicanism. The decay of the great families by impoverishment, the prolonged absence, and the loss of life which the Crusades involved, developed the power of the kings ; and the destruction of the Templars marks at once the victory of the crown over the nobles, and the extinction of the crusading spirit. The rise of the Levantine commerce hastened the growth of the towns ; and Venice and Philip the Fair instance the two tendencies to which it is due that the Holy See lost so much of its power, and Christendom the places which had been made holy by its Founder.

There is abundant evidence of the close connection between the Crusades and the predominance of the Church in its contest with the state, and of the identity of the spirit which animated the Crusader and the Guelf. The most comprehensive of the mediæval chronicles was finished in a first edition by Abbot Ekkehard in the year 1099. The war between the priesthood and the empire was at its height, and the abbot is an imperialist. Seven years later he rewrote his work. In the interval he had been to the Holy Land, he had seen the handiwork of the Popes, and he had become an ardent advocate of their cause. The testimony of the legend is not less significant. Godfrey, like Ekkehard, was originally a partisan of the emperor before he became the champion of the Church ; and the poets, who chose the first king of Jerusalem as their hero, have heightened the contrast between the two portions of his career. They represent him as the foremost of the soldiers of the empire ;

in the battle between Henry and Rodolph, he carries the imperial banner, and slays with his own hand the emperor who had the support of the clergy. Then he followed his master to the siege of Rome, and was the first to enter the place. But the sacrilege was punished by an attack of that Roman fever so well known to the soldiers of the empire, which never left him till he made a vow to take the cross; and then, when he had performed his penance, and his work was over, God sent the fever once more, which carried him away in the first year of his reign. These fables, recorded by William of Malmesbury, show that the general belief agreed with the idea of St. Bernard,—“*ita qui corruebat contra pontificiam militans, major excitatus est.*” The same change is repeated on a much greater scale in the life of Frederic the First. Whilst the beginning of the movement exactly coincides with that exalted position of the Church which was created for her by Hildebrand, they declined together, and the Pope stood alone for many generations, appealing in vain to the princes for a new Crusade. It was precisely at the close of that period of ecclesiastical supremacy that the news of the fall of Ptolemais and the total loss of the Holy Land reached Europe. The Pope wrote to France; but the prelates and nobles replied that to preach the cross was useless so long as the Greeks, the Sicilians, and the Aragonese disturbed the peace of Europe. This allusion to the interests of France in Naples proves how completely, in the generation which had seen St. Lewis, attachment to the state prevailed over attachment to the Church, and the dynasty over the old noblesse. The Crusades had checked the ardour of the contest with the monarchy by enlisting all men in an enterprise with which every Catholic sympathised, but which necessarily placed him in a position of subordination to the Holy See, which Ghibelline feelings could not survive. Yet it is a singular fact that the idea of rescuing the holy sepulchre, which had derived all its vitality and power from the influence of the Holy See, should have outlived that influence, and have sought to recommend itself at the expense of the papal interests. A Frenchman of the reign of Boniface VIII., a disciple of St. Thomas, submitted to the king of France a plan for the restoration of the Frankish dominion in the East, the first condition of which was the establishment of peace in Christendom. This, he says, would be obtained if Philip would convey the states of the Church into the hands of one of his sons, with the title of Senator of Rome, giving the Pope, by way of compensation, a yearly pension. His power, having the authority of the Holy See at its disposal, would then be supreme, and the kings of the earth would be ready to follow him to Palestine.

---



## Current Events.

### HOME AFFAIRS.

#### *Parliament and the Ministry.*

*June 19th.* The Bill for the abolition of Church-rates was thrown out on the third reading, by the casting-vote of the Speaker, after a division of 274 to 274. The only notable circumstance in this debate was the proposal of the Home Secretary to ticket Churchmen. Referring to the compromise proposed by Mr. Cross, he said: "The objection I have to the plan of the honourable member is, that it starts with the assumption that every occupier in a parish is a member of the Established Church, and puts upon those who are not members of the Established Church the obligation of keeping their names off the list of ratepayers. I would proceed in a reverse direction. I would begin by laying the charge on those who are members of the Church, and who testify their membership by attendance at a place of worship. It seems to me that a list should be made of persons attending the church and forming the congregation in each parish, and that there should be a power of imposing a compulsory rate upon them." Mr. Stansfeld, the most advanced Radical theorist in the House of Commons, a friend of Mazzini, touched on the question of conscience: "It has been said that the question of Church-rates, which in its inception was probably a question of conscience, has become a question of supremacy. I accept the antithesis with this qualification, that the question of supremacy has been superadded to the question of conscience which remains." But the conscientious element has been made so completely subordinate to the political question by Mr. Bright, as to induce many to oppose the bill out of fear of democratic encroachment. "With the Nonconformists," he said, "it is a question of supremacy on the part of a great establishment which is at least as much political as religious—against which their forefathers have

fought, and against which they are obliged inevitably still to contend. . . . They come down from the Puritans of an earlier period, who, I believe, have gained for England all that there is of freedom in the English constitution."

In contradiction with this view of our constitutional history, it has been often asserted that the liberties of England are an inheritance from Catholic times, developed under the influence and through the independence of the Church. Unquestionably the substance of our constitution is derived from the middle ages, and the fundamental rights of parliament, the right of voting supplies, making laws, and controlling the administration both of finance and of law, were secured in the fifteenth century. Moreover, our old Teutonic system of jurisprudence which had been interwoven during nine hundred years with Catholic ideas and moulded to Catholic habits, was never interrupted or interpolated by the introduction of the Roman law, which, all over the Continent, subverted the mediæval state. Nevertheless, the old constitution was practically abrogated by the royal supremacy and the Reformation. For a hundred years the ancient forms lost their power, the monarchy was absolute, and the work of suppressing Catholicism secured to it the support of all classes. Absolutism never prevailed in England, but on the basis of ecclesiastical tyranny. The Puritans were therefore its natural opponents under the Stuarts, as the Catholic clergy had been under the Normans; and the opposition to Strafford had a strong political resemblance with the struggle of St. Anselm, St. Thomas, and Langton against kings who strove to degrade the Catholic Church to the position which the Protestant Church occupied in England in the days of Parker and of Laud.

In reply to Mr. Bright, Mr. Disraeli used an argument against the

abolition of Church-rates which brings forward the Established Church as a third candidate for the credit of having been the safeguard of our political freedom. "The Church of England is not a mere depository of doctrine. The Church of England is a part of England; it is a part of our strength, and a part of our liberties; a part of our national character. It is a chief security for that local government which a Radical reformer has thought fit to-day to designate as an archaeological curiosity. It is a principal barrier against that centralising supremacy which has been in all other countries so fatal to liberty." It is probable that Mr. Disraeli would find it difficult to explain how the English Established Church affords a greater security against centralisation than the Catholic Church in countries like France and Austria, which have been the nurseries of centralisation. At the same time the allusion to the parish as the seat of local self-government leads to the consideration of a very important question. Originally the parish was the only sphere of local administration in which the principle of election was carried out; and it is moreover the only natural division of the country; the only one, at least, which was adopted, and not introduced, by the government. The people were distributed by the State as they grouped themselves naturally round the altars and the graves. The Church-rate first bestowed on the ecclesiastical congregation an administrative office; and out of the meeting of the parishioners in the sacristy for the purpose of raising it, the political function of the vestry was developed. Its importance increased with the decline of the ecclesiastical authority. The secularisation of Church property created pauperism by altering the mode of cultivation, and at the same time removed the protection which the poor had found from religious houses. That provision, therefore, which had belonged exclusively to the department of the Church, was transferred, as a secular office, to the parochial administration. The Reformation having given to the parish its political importance, the immense increase of local charges has secularised it altogether, and the Church-rate—out of which this altered relation of

the parish to the administration originally arose—has long ceased to be a principal or essential part of its concerns. The parishes have afforded the framework for the development of a vast system of local taxation, which has so completely overgrown their original character, that the coincidence of the secular with the ecclesiastical community is not only unnecessary but unreasonable. The separation of Church and State is not involved in a distinction of their duties and their powers, the want of which is a result of that confusion of ideas which the royal supremacy brings with it.

The untenable position of the parish as the pivot of local self-government has become manifest in the poor-law system, in which a long inquiry has established a strong case against the efficiency of the local boards, and in which an altered system of rating can hardly fail before long to be introduced. The Committee on the English Poor-Law concluded the examination of the Catholic case, but postponed its report to next year. The published evidence will prepare men's minds for the necessity of a further great step in the course which was commenced by the Act of Emancipation. That measure has borne less abundant fruit because it was carried by intimidation, and was conceded by a hostile government to force, not to reason. To some extent, therefore, it has had the character of a compromise, not of the establishment of a new principle in our government, from which would necessarily flow a series of consequences altering in every department the position of Catholics. The law still imposes disabilities upon us; and in the administration of the law we still find that our social power is not equal to our political rights, and that there is a wide difference between the position of Catholics in the army, where they are under the authority of a constitutional statesman, and in other departments in which the influence of the State is not supreme. A minority has no security for its rights in concessions obtained by threats from the weakness of parties, or by trading on the perils of the State. There is a reaction against compliance to which the will did not



consent; and the majority may take advantage of moments of strength to revoke what was wrung from its weakness. Emancipation was not inconsistent with the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. The scandal was, that that act should have been introduced and supported by men in whose party emancipation was regarded as a necessity, not of policy, but of principle. On this ground, however, there are many public men ready and anxious to support in Parliament the recommendations which will be made by the Committee for the freedom of religious worship and education among the Catholic paupers.

The death of Lord Campbell was followed by the elevation of Sir Richard Bethell to the woolsack, and Mr. Roundell Palmer became Solicitor-General. At his election he declared himself a supporter of the foreign policy of the government, as not exceeding the legitimate interference in favour of the liberties of nations. His political programme nearly resembled the ideas of Mr. Gladstone, and his acceptance of office adds to the influence of that statesman, and is not unlikely to exert a salutary influence upon him. In the trial of the Emperor of Austria against Kossuth for the printing of Hungarian paper-money, Mr. Roundell Palmer was selected by the Austrian government as the least likely among our first-rate lawyers to be biased by revolutionary sympathies. In addressing the Richmond electors, he spoke of the disappearance of strongly marked differences between opposite parties. The consequence was, he said, that the struggle for power was more arduous and violent. It was for the advantage of the country that a government should be reasonably strong; but the approximation of opinions militated against it. There were two kinds of Conservatism,—one was destructive, the other was common to all good Liberals. The destructive stood still, was selfish, advocated class privileges, thought every thing was as good as it should be, and disliked all change. Such Conservatism would revolutionise society. True Conservatism was progress,—that which was stationary in the world went to decay and died; that which was progressive lived and

grew. The progress of reform should be constant and steady, and on this the security and prosperity of the nation depended. The policy of the present administration was safe and progressive, and he felt it no slight honour to be connected with it.

An event which was universally felt to be a public calamity, but which none have so much reason to deplore as the Catholics, soon after gave rise to more important changes. Early in July it became known that the best of the English statesmen was sinking rapidly under a mortal disease. Lord Herbert remained in office for some weeks after all hopes of his recovery were abandoned, as the government had some difficulty in arranging the new distribution of offices that was to ensue; for Lord John Russell was to be raised at the end of the session to the House of Lords. At the time of Sidney Herbert's elevation at the end of last year, the same thing was already spoken of; but it was deemed necessary that Lord John Russell should defend his foreign policy in the House of Commons during the session, and the removal simultaneously of two secretaries of state to another place was not advisable. But when the session was drawing to a close, and a new Secretary for War was to be chosen among the Commoners, these reasons no longer availed; and on July 19th, in a debate on the annexation of Sardinia, Lord John Russell delivered his last speech in the House of Commons. He said: "With regard to the question of Sardinia, I entirely admit the importance of that island; and I have in despatches repeatedly expressed my opinion that the annexation of the island of Sardinia to France would be a great disturbance of the territorial distribution of power in Europe, and would affect the distribution of power in the Mediterranean. It may be an object of desire and ambition to an ambitious Power; but I must put in the balance the consequences, the very grave consequences, which would follow from any attempt on the part of France to annex the island of Sardinia. It is not a transaction which could take place merely between the Emperor of the French and the King of Sardinia. It must put an end at once to any intimate alliance

between this country and France. At the same time I must say it is not my opinion that the government of the Emperor of the French will attempt to annex the island of Sardinia, seeing the grave consequences that would ensue. . . . Sir, I admit—one must admit—that in the present state of Europe, and seeing what has passed during the last three or four years, it would be very unwise in the Government of this country, very unwise also in the Parliament of this country, to rest in a blind confidence that there would be no aggressions, no annexations, no ambitious projects entertained. The Emperor of the French is very powerful. Every body sees the great power that he has. But, at the same time, if it was his intention, as I believe it is his intention, to preserve the peace of Europe and remain upon the most friendly terms with England, I am not at all sure, I cannot rest in any perfect confidence, that the state of public opinion in France, that the state of opinion in the French Chambers or in the French army, might not in a most sudden manner alter the whole policy of the Government. . . . It is a great misfortune for England, and it is a great misfortune for Europe, that such costly armaments should be kept up in time of peace; but we should not remedy that if we were to disarm, and to leave other nations to increase their preparations. I trust that no short-sighted view of our interests, no narrow spirit of saving with regard to any particular tax, will induce this country, in the present state of Europe and the world, to maintain a navy and army which are not adequate in all respects to the position we ought to occupy. Not merely the greatness, but the very safety of this country is concerned in her state of preparation."

Sir George C. Lewis became Secretary for War; Sir George Grey Home Secretary; Mr. Cardwell Chancellor of the Duchy; Sir Robert Peel, whose Liberalism contains less of true liberality than that of almost any other public man, became Irish Secretary; Mr. Layard became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, for which he is at least qualified by a knowledge of foreign countries. These changes seriously damaged the Government;

but the greatest loss was the death of Lord Herbert, August 2d. He had sought relief for his failing health in the repose of the House of Lords, where he did not attempt to sustain his reputation as an orator, and had ceased during nearly the whole session to be personally before the public. As a statesman, he had no other serious fault but his popularity. The long ostracism of the followers of Peel, the obloquy which was incurred by the opponents of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and the outcry against the management of the Crimean War, his lofty spirit could easily bear. But the ease with which men were won by the charm of his manner accustomed him to aim at conciliation, and to seek the utmost gratification from his natural advantages. This was the source of that want of decision and of energy which was the gravest fault imputed to him, and which appeared still graver because the consciousness of his great faculties did not conceal from him the limits of his knowledge. He redeemed these defects by extraordinary merits. He reluctantly consented, under the influence of Mr. Gladstone, to resign his office on the Crimean inquiry; but the political union of the two men came to an end after what occurred on that occasion, and Mr. Herbert held aloof when the Tories so nearly succeeded in obtaining the services of Mr. Gladstone. Whilst Mr. Gladstone supported Lord Derby's Government with his vote, both in the division on their Reform Bill and in the division which expelled them from office, Mr. Herbert was one of the most vehement of their opponents. In consequence of this difference he made that remarkable declaration, in a speech which was soon after quoted in these pages for the truest exposition of Catholic policy, that the political ostracism of the Peelite party had not been unjust, but that the Peelites existed as a party no longer. In the administration which followed, he was the soul of that policy of armed defence and distrust of France by which he created the Volunteers, and carried, in spite of the obstinate resistance and public opposition of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the measure for the fortification of the coasts. On foreign questions he differed widely



from his more popular colleague, and shared as little his enthusiasm for the Italian Revolution as for the despotism of Napoleon. In exact harmony with the liberality of his speeches on Catholic affairs, and with his care of Catholic interests in the administration of the army, he understood that it was the duty and the interest of England to defend the independence of the Holy See. For all these reasons he was better qualified for the first than for the second rank; and he would have been, not perhaps more successful, but more fully understood, and still more deeply esteemed, if he had become Prime Minister. It may be that no minister would have the power to do for the Church all that policy and justice require to be done on the Continent and at home; but if there was one of our statesmen who knew that duty, and would have tried to discharge it, it was the man who so distinctly foresaw, and so vigorously prepared for, impending war with France, and who knew that it would be the signal for an altered policy, and for the revival of public principles which have been too long forgotten.

Parliament was prorogued by commission August 6th. The only important paragraphs of the Queen's speech were the following:

"Her Majesty commands us to inform you that her relations with foreign powers are friendly and satisfactory, and her Majesty trusts there is no danger of any disturbance of the peace of Europe.

"The progress of events in Italy has led to the union of the greater part of the peninsula in one monarchy under King Victor Emmanuel. Her Majesty has throughout abstained from any act of interference in the transactions which have led to this result, and her earnest wish as to these affairs is, that they may be settled in the manner best suited to the welfare and happiness of the Italian people.

"The dissensions which arose, some months ago, in the United States of North America have, unfortunately, assumed the character of open war. Her Majesty, deeply lamenting this calamitous result, has determined, in common with the other powers of Europe, to preserve a strict neutrality between the contending parties.

"Her Majesty commands us to inform you that the measures adopted for the restoration of order and tranquillity in Syria, in virtue of conventions between her Majesty, the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of the French, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, and the Sultan, having accomplished their purpose, the European troops which, in pursuance of those conventions, were for a time stationed in Syria to coöperate with the troops and authorities of the Sultan, have been withdrawn; and her Majesty trusts that the arrangements which have been made for the administration of the districts which had been disturbed will henceforward secure their internal tranquillity."

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

### *Austria and Hungary.*

The problem which has occupied the efforts of the Austrian Government since February is the most complicated, the most extensive, and the most difficult that could fall to the lot of a civilised community. It is the reconstruction of a legitimate order where a long period of absolutism has crushed the institutions and broken off the traditions of history; the application of a system in harmony with the irresistible exigencies of modern opinion to a society

preserving many of the forms and much of the spirit of a remote age; and the establishment of a fair equipoise between the concentration of authority and the claims of autonomy, and between necessities of a highly developed state and the rights of dissimilar nationalities. No modern power has ever attempted so much, or has ever accomplished any one of these objects. The difficulty is increased by the coincidence that the same public calamities which have compelled the Emperor to commence the enterprise have so far lowered the prestige

of his authority as to give courage and confidence to the opponents of his design; but the real difficulty, which would make success problematical even without the Hungarian opposition, is the diversity of opinions and interests among the public men of the empire.

Since the misfortunes of 1859 and the retirement of Bach, who was identified in the public mind with the Concordat and the bureaucratic system of administration, the advanced Liberal party have risen in importance, and have regarded each successive change as a concession to their views. They represent what is emphatically understood by modern ideas. They are not democrats, and would deny that they are revolutionists. According to their theory, the government ought to be founded on the will of the people, expressed by a representative assembly elected with the lowest franchise consistent with the security of property; the nobility should sit in an Upper House, without real influence; the parliamentary majority should be supreme in the land, by means of a responsible ministry, and a highly developed system of administration. Individual liberty should be carefully protected against every authority and every limitation but that of the state; while freedom of settlement would disengage men from all local restraint, freedom of conscience would abrogate religious disabilities and ecclesiastical authority, freedom of trade would open out unrestricted competition, and remove all the antiquated and unpopular remnants of an imperfect civilisation. Centralisation would thus remain unimpaired, but controlled by Parliament. The State would lose none of its authority, but it would be exercised by the people's representatives. Local and provincial self-government, the visible action of religion, and every kind of intolerance but that which is directed against bodies accused of intolerance, are the special objects of their antipathy. These views, not very remote from those entertained in England by a party of which we may take Lord Russell as the type, prevail in the middle class in Vienna, and are defended by the majority of the newspapers. These were, until last year, the ex-

clusive organs and guides of public opinion; and since the commencement of constitutional life, the editors have become conspicuous parliamentary leaders. One of the most influential of these is Kuranda, editor of the *Ost Deutsche Post*, and a Jew; for the papers are almost entirely bought, or conducted, or written by Jews; and the influence both of their capitalists and writers is very great. Hence a particular feature of Vienna liberalism is hostility to the Church, even in her own sphere, which takes the shape of attacks on the Concordat. For the hatred which the common people feel for the Jews is as strong as in the reign of King John, and their emancipation has been retarded almost as much by the fear of an outbreak against them as by the fear of the influence they would obtain. In the course of this year their unpopularity has shown itself ominously on several occasions in Hungary, in Galicia, and at Prague. Consequently, while they are stronger in Austria than in any other country, they live nowhere in so much danger or so much alarm. The terror is constantly before them that in a revolution they would be the victims of the popular fury. Against this peril they endeavour to provide in two ways—by attacking the clergy and by attacking religion. From a demoralised and irreligious people they have nothing to fear; on the other hand, they hope to save themselves by directing popular feeling against the priesthood. For this purpose every species of calumny and ridicule is brought to bear on the priests; and the Jews reckon upon it that in a moment of revolution they will be able to lead the mob against them. For these reasons they are stronger and less unpopular in the capital than in the provinces, for the inhabitants of Vienna are the most demoralised of the Austrians, and they are moreover in league with the Jews in favour of centralisation. Of these two elements, the Viennese Liberals and the Jews, the Centralist party is composed. "I have seen," says Sainte-Foi, "some who leaned towards the future like men who wish to grasp an object; and the world applauded them, for it said: These are men of progress and of action. But they



had nothing behind them; the past humiliated them, the future flattered them, and none were more selfish than they."

A party less powerful than this, but gradually gaining ground under the influence of Hungary, is the Centrifugal party in Bohemia and the Slavonic provinces. Their head is Palacky, one of the first of living historians, and the greatest scholar of the Slavonic world. Their Parliamentary leader is Rieger. Three elements combine to make up their peculiar view. The first is a reaction against the centralisation and constant interference of the Austrian Government, which was oppressive under Joseph and Francis, but which became intolerable after the revolution of 1848 had enabled Bach to organise a new and more vigorous bureaucratic system. From this point of view the parliamentary centralisation is as hateful as the absolutist, and the predominance of a German majority as the authority of a German minister; for a special jealousy of the Germans is another element of this opinion. Bohemia maintained for centuries a contest for independence against the empire, and its princes were long the rivals of the Habsburgs. In the fifteenth century their patriotism was strengthened by the rise of a national heresy; and the memory of the Hussite days, and of the wars of extermination carried on with the Germans, is still living and powerful among them, and is the great topic of Palacky's works. Again, in the seventeenth, they renewed—with the assistance of Protestantism—the old rebellion, and gave the signal of the 'Thirty Years' War. The tremendous execution which followed the victory of Tilly extinguished Protestantism for a time, but made the old animosity more bitter, and there is consequently a strong Protestant feeling mixed up with the national tendencies of the Czechs. Thirdly, the Panslavist intrigues have been at work, and Russia gains all the sympathies that Austria loses among them. This party forms a small minority in the Reichsrath, but sympathises with Hungary.

The absolute Conservatives or anti-constitutional party, have lost the day and are no longer powerful; but they were responsible for the delay

which has proved so nearly fatal to the state. They are represented in the Reichsrath by some of the great nobles, such as Clam-Gallas, who was formerly an intense admirer of Bonapartism, and who bears much of the reproach of the disaster of Magenta. Many of them, despairing of their country, have refused to take part in the new order of things. The most distinguished of these was Prince Frederic Schwarzenberg, who published, 14th April, his farewell to public life. These men look with horror at all that modern liberalism destroys to make way for its own short-lived creations, and they discern democracy and irreligion in the wake of liberalism. A representative government, the irresistible instrument of popular opinion, the prerogative of the crown taken away, and the privileges of the various orders sequestered; the Church despoiled, insulted, and oppressed, the rights of the provinces crushed by centralisation and a new distribution of property following with distant but inevitable certainty the new distribution of power,—this is the picture of the future which drives many honourable and high-minded men to bury themselves in the ruins of the past. Among them, too, there are many to whom the words apply: "I have seen men whose mind and whose heart were turned towards the past; and the world admired them, and said, See how constant and how faithful they are. But their past had been propitious, the present was hostile to them, and the future threatening; and they threw themselves on the past as on a couch, because they were indolent, and cared only for themselves."

Equally remote from each of these fractions, a small and unpopular party stands, to whom, if the state survives, its future government will probably be committed. These are the advocates of self-government on the basis of historical tradition, the party of organism and of autonomy. They wish each province to preserve its individuality and its rights, and desire to revive every where, as far as possible, the remains of the old representative institutions, modifying them according to the altered condition of the time. They demand full municipal

liberties, and accept only so much of centralisation and unity as political necessity requires. They are not, therefore, zealous for an imperial parliament, but hold to the authority of the crown, limiting and fencing it by an improved system of provincial estates. Parliamentary government is a necessary evil, wrong in theory, founded on popular sovereignty, and closely allied to revolutionary principles. But this they deem only a reason to adapt themselves to the new circumstances, and to use the institutions they do not heartily approve for the good of the state. They are the Conservatives of the Reichsrath, small in number, and powerful only by means of a perilous coalition with the Centrifugal party, and by the rising ability and influence of Count Clam-Martinitz their leader. This distinguished man, the son of Field-marshal Clam, who, but for his early death, was designated as Metternich's successor, and of an English mother, is only thirty-five, and has come prominently forward only within the last two years. He began public life as the confidential adviser of Count Stadion, in the ministry that gave the constitution of March 1849, and many of the documents which the government issued in connection with that ill-planned and ill-fated scheme proceeded from his pen. He rose rapidly in the public service, and became civil governor of Cracow in 1856. When Bach's administration was shattered by the defeat in Italy, the Emperor sent for Clam-Martinitz, and offered him the ministry of the interior. But he refused,—in consequence, it is said, of his disagreement with Bruck,—and, determined to watch his opportunity, resigned his office in Poland. In conjunction with several of the great nobles, he set about organising a party, of which the *Vaterland* became the organ in the press, and in which he obtained the support of the houses of Lichtenstein, Schwarzenberg, and Wolkstein. His great achievement has been to convert the aristocracy from a party of resistance into partisans of a definite scheme of progress, and to commit the Austrian Conservatives to a policy of reform. Yet it is hardly conceivable that with such materials his design should succeed. He will be called upon to do battle with the

revolution, and consequently with the perpetual temptation to seek safety from democratic encroachment in stagnation, to identify change with innovation, and Conservatism with immobility. Judging from his conduct in the enlarged Reichsrath of last year, he is personally free from this tendency. By demanding the restoration of the political rights of each historic unit in the empire, he obtained the coöperation of the Hungarians, led by Count Szechen, with the enemies of centralisation, and thus secured the majority. A minority insisted on a central parliament without provincial assemblies, and unfortunately no combination of the two views was possible. A national representation was the proper and necessary complement of that system of provincial autonomy advocated by Clam-Martinitz. But the Hungarians would not accept a scheme which gave unity to the empire, and the Liberals were opposed to the local self-government of the provinces. The result was, that constitution of October which restored local rights without saving the unity of the state, and therefore placed Hungary in an exceptional and privileged position, from which she has refused to recede. At the beginning of the restoration, the first political writer of the day undertook to show that the constitution was no security for freedom without those institutions which belong to the programme of the Austrian Conservatives. "Municipal power," says Fiévée, "and provincial power are the basis of the liberties of the monarchy. They cannot embarrass the action of the government; that is, they cannot prevent it from making peace, or from making war, or from managing and commanding the army, or from appointing to the great offices, or from balancing and conciliating the interests of the various classes of society. But they annoy the government as universal administrator . . . The municipal and the provincial power once established, and similar interests united under the name of orders, or of corporations, whether you add two Houses or recognise three estates, you will have as much liberty as the times will bear. . . . Two Houses, or what is now called the representative system, is the complement of the other institutions favourable to liberty. For my part I see no ad-



vantage in it, excepting that whenever politics speak in public they are obliged to be moral, and nothing contributes more to form the morals of a nation. . . . All public and free discussion on politics is essentially moral." Then, taking his example from Austria, he says, "If it should some day please the House of Austria to unite members of each provincial assembly in a general assembly; or if the peculiar conditions of its policy, or of its dominions, make this union appear useless or dangerous, there will be neither more nor less liberty in each province, provided each has its own assembly to defend its customs, its local laws founded on its customs, and to make itself heard by the Emperor. . . . Liberty must be secured by the provincial assemblies, which will protect their local interests, customs, and laws against the projects of a general assembly. . . . It is certain that only the establishment of provincial administrations is an insurmountable barrier against the errors of liberty, which terminate always in despotism, and sometimes in dissolution. . . . They are the only intermediate bodies that can exist in a state without the distinction of orders. The parliament is a legislative power; the tribunals a judiciary power. They are independent, and cannot therefore be intermediate. When there is nothing between the general administration and the people, there can never be either freedom or stability."

Another fraction, of no note if we consider the grouping of ideas, but of some consequence in the Reichsrath, consists of loyal cavaliers, who support the Emperor for his own sake, in the spirit of men whose ancestors have fought for the dynasty faithfully and unconditionally in every war, and who stand by it with the same fidelity in the great crisis of its existence. The chief of this party, Prince Auersperg, is President of the Upper Chamber.

With this arrangement of parties, Schmerling, who belongs properly to none of them, has to work out his scheme of February, and to carry on the great constitutional struggle with Hungary. He has to rely, out of the Reichsrath, on the bureaucracy trained by Bach, men wholly regardless of ancient traditions, familiar only

with the state as it has been reconstructed since 1848, averse to provincial rights, to self-government, and to the Concordat, but entirely devoted to the minister; secondly, on the small group of Hungarians who wish to save the constitution of the empire and to prevent a breach; thirdly, on the army, whose feelings for discipline and authority were expressed by Benedek, when he spoke with contempt of the ignorant civilians and cowardly magnates, who play into the hands of the revolution, and of the enemy against whom the army knows that it is arrayed. In the Reichsrath itself he is sure of large majorities, so long as the conflict endures between Vienna and Pesth.

The statesman on whose firmness and ability the fate of Austria depends earned his parliamentary reputation and experience at Frankfort. When the Parliament met, he was Austrian envoy at the Diet, and speedily became the chief of the first national ministry in Germany. "He appeared," says an opponent, "at first sight, a man of a plain exterior and great calmness. To a close observer, his sharp and not distinguished features gave the impression of extraordinary cunning. The passion that flashed but rarely from his gray eye seemed to have become congealed in a coldness of manner that betrayed to his friends the consciousness of an exulting confidence, and could drive an adversary to distraction. What he said was simple in tone and gesture, but it touched the opposite party to the quick, for it seemed ever to cover a contemptuous irony; and the listener was persuaded that the speaker was filled with a profound disdain, not only for his opponents, but also for those whom he was sure of convincing. The easy, negligent tone, the nasal voice, the smooth indifference, proclaimed the far-seeing calculator." His first appearance in debate, 26th May 1848, gives a more definite notion of his parliamentary character. A conflict had occurred at Mentz, between the people and the Prussian soldiers, and the revolutionary party made use of the occurrence to vindicate the mob against the army, to vilify the Prussians, and to create a breach between them and the Austrians, by dwelling on the very differ-

ent conduct of the Austrian portion of the garrison. Schmerling turned these materials to account in a masterly way. "As an Austrian," he exclaimed, "I repudiate that praise. It has been uttered not so innocently as it pretends to be, but in order to destroy the good feeling that subsists between the Austrian and the Prussian regiments of the garrison. The object is to divide the two portions of one and the same German army. The Austrian soldier is only a German soldier, the comrade in arms of the Prussian and of every German with whom he is led, either against a foreign enemy, or for the suppression of anarchy at home. I am convinced that the Austrian troops, if they had heard their Emperor and their state insulted as Prussia is proved to have been, would have exhibited the same indignation."

The men who have led the Hungarian Diet, and are up to this moment at the head of the nation, Deak and Eötvös, are second in character or ability to no statesmen of the present day. Deak was the leader of the Opposition at Pesth in 1840, and enjoyed the highest reputation both as an orator and a lawyer. One of his opponents, Mailath, says of that period of his career that no man stood higher, that he loved his own party and respected his adversaries; and he describes him as the most consummate speaker, deficient only in passion and imagination. He goes on to say that in the reforms which Deak demanded, he went no further than the most intelligent Conservatives. His conduct in 1843 gives an idea of the strict and almost dogged attachment to legality and formal right which distinguishes his character, and explains the successes and the failures in his career. The elections of 1843 were made on the question of the taxation of the nobles. Deak declared to the electors of his county that he would not accept their mandate unless on condition of voting against the exemption of the nobles. Disturbances ensued, and the election was irregular. Afterwards a new election was made; Deak was chosen, and an instruction was carried in favour of taxation. But Deak deemed the proceedings unconstitutional, and declined the election. The conse-

quence of this moderation was, that he was outstripped by Kossuth, and lost his popularity. He was minister of justice in the first Hungarian ministry, and here again he soon retired before the extreme party. His time came when the Opposition could take its stand on Conservative and legitimate ground, and in this position he has shown himself an expert tactician.

Eötvös, like Deak, an earnest Catholic, stands high among the political writers of the day. His work on the "influence of the prevailing ideas on the state" is the best existing confutation of the theories of democratic Liberalism, and an excellent defence of the principle of the limitation of authority. Denying the sovereignty of the majority, and the omnipotence of the state, he establishes authority and liberty on the autonomy of moral individualities. The foremost of these, he argues, is the nation. As liberty is due to every corporation, as well as to every individual, and as the power of the state is limited by private rights, the same respect is due to the rights, liberties, and independence of each nationality. In a later work on "the guarantees of the power and unity of Austria," published in 1859, he demands, that the empire should be divided into three parts, a German, a Magyar, and a Slavonic state, that centralisation should be abolished, self-government revived, and the independence of nationality made the foundation of a new system. Now that he has an opportunity of acting on his theories, he is the ablest supporter of Deak's policy, and with great consistency proclaims the unity as well as the independence of nationalities, and allies his cause with that of German and of Italian unity. Both of these eminent men are sincere Conservatives and zealous enemies of revolution. They rest their case on tradition, on the continuity of right, on the history rather than the wishes of their country. Whether, in appealing to the laws of 1848, in denying the validity of every act of the government since the Hungarian War, and in making common cause with Garibaldi, Napoleon, and the *National verein*, they occupy a position which they can defend against the revolutionists, or whether



they have conceded so much that the victory must ultimately be with the most consistent arguer,—whether, in short, their principle will bear being pushed to its extreme consequences without an actual revolution, cannot long remain a problem.

The elections for the provincial assemblies were completed in the first week of April. In Hungary a large majority belonged to the extreme Opposition, who looked up to Teleky as their leader. In the German dominions a very large proportion of electors voted with the feeling that the decisive moment for the empire had arrived, and that all the resources of the state were needed to resist separation. During the elections a ministerial crisis occurred at Vienna. The statute for the organisation of Transylvania was drawn up most favourably to the Magyars, and adopted by the Emperor without the knowledge of the German ministers. They at once resigned, but a pacification was effected. The Hungarian ministers were able to hold their own against Schmerling, for the opening of the Diet made it most important at that moment not to offend Hungary. It was also the policy of Schmerling to give no provocation, and to allow the Hungarian movement to take its own course. The country was well garrisoned, but nothing was done to check the Opposition, no impediment was put in their way, and nobody appeared at the Diet to speak for Austria. In pursuance of this policy, the *Judex Curie* announced, April 3d, that the judiciary system proposed by the Hungarian Conference was adopted, and would be submitted to the Diet. The Diet was summoned to meet at Buda, which is the royal residence, and a fortress. Even the Hungarians in the ministry feared the influence which the mob would acquire if it met at Pesth. But the Hungarians insisted on Pesth. Deak declared it a matter of no consequence.

*April 6th.* The provincial assemblies were opened through nearly the whole of the empire. The Diet of Hungary met at Buda and adjourned to Pesth. The *Judex Curie*, Count Apponyi, in his opening speech, said that the Emperor's purpose was "to restore, secure, modify, and improve

the constitution of the land, and to bestow equal rights on all the states." The diploma of October, he said, "*restored* her constitution to Hungary, and *conferred* similar rights on the other territories." The diploma of the resignation of Ferdinand and of the Emperor's father, and the diploma of the constitution of February, were to be submitted to the Diet before they sent the representatives of the kingdom to Vienna. In the first discussion that ensued, one of the magnates demanded a Hungarian ministry. The language of Apponyi was intended to signify that the constitution had never been legally suspended, and that Hungary simply recovered her rights. But in fact the other territories had also their representative institutions, which had been for the most part dormant longer than those of Hungary, but which were in no greater need of modification, and which had never been forfeited by rebellion; which were, therefore, both formally and essentially not less valid. At Salzburg one of the ministers, Lasser, was a member of the assembly. He declared that the work in hand was the fundamental reconstruction of the state on a new model, without reference to the past, and thus justified the statement of Apponyi, and admitted the difference of principle on which the constitution of Hungary and those of the rest of the empire stood. But the Carinthian assembly, in voting an address of thanks to the Emperor, added a prayer that, in introducing the new system, no favour or exception should be allowed to any portion of the monarchy. Several of the German assemblies dwelt, in their addresses, on the unity of the empire. Some passed an address of confidence in the ministers, and in that of Upper Austria it was proposed to thank them for having induced the Emperor to grant the constitution.

The most important of the assemblies was that of Prague, where the opposition of the Czechs broke out at once, altogether independent of that in Hungary. There was even a small democratic section, which condemned the constitution as not sufficiently liberal; but this was the only instance of the kind in the whole empire. Clam-

Martinitz, who sympathised with the Bohemian movement, so far as it was hostile to absolutism and centralisation, urged the assembly to support the Emperor. Their first care, he said, ought to be to save the empire; the province would then save herself; and the only danger came from the blindness of the Hungarians. By another singular combination, Cardinal Schwarzenberg moved that the Emperor should be asked to come to Prague to be crowned King of Bohemia, which, as a victory of the Centrifugal party, was adopted unanimously, and was even acceded to by the Emperor.

A very different interest belongs to the assembly of Tyrol, where the Italian part of the population was not represented. In accordance with the principle of self-government, which was being carried out in every department, and had already been conceded to the Catholic Church, and to the Protestants of Hungary, a law was issued, April 8th, regulating the position of the Protestants out of Hungary, by which they obtained perfect equality, the right of governing their own ecclesiastical interests, access to all public appointments, and freedom from all payments to the Catholic priesthood. This was in strict conformity with the spirit of the new institutions. Religious toleration and religious liberty are essentially distinct from each other. One is a negative permission, the other a positive right. One is wrong as a principle, the other is a necessary consequence of the principles of a free government. It is quite consistent with civil liberty to refuse toleration, but it is not consistent with it to refuse self-government to a tolerated religion. For it is a part of the theory of freedom that each body in the state controls its own internal affairs. The government of a religion by the state implies the government of a part by the whole, the control of a minority by the majority, which is the contradiction of the principle of self-government. On the other hand, it is quite as true, relatively, that religious unity should be preserved where it is possible, as that liberty should be granted where it is claimed. To enforce unity where it does not exist is always disastrous to the state that attempts it.

France, Spain, and England are sufficiently impressive examples. To introduce toleration where unity is preserved is equally erroneous; for abstract toleration makes the state indifferent,—that is, atheistical,—and connects it, not with the religion of a part of the inhabitants, but with a system which is professed by none. The theory of self-government, therefore, requires, not that all religions should be tolerated, but that all tolerated religions should be free. It condemns alike exclusive protection and persecution. Against the principle of the new law the Austrian Catholics had nothing to urge; but a dispute arose which involved the question, not of religious liberty, but of provincial self-government, and the maintenance of local laws. Tyrol was always so peculiarly a Catholic country, that it was exempted from the operation of the Edict of Toleration of 1781; and when in 1859 Francis Joseph issued his patent for the regulation of the Protestant churches, he engaged to make no alteration in Tyrol without consulting the estates of the province. The law of last April was of general application, and disregarded the habits of the various countries. It was to be foreseen that difficulties would follow.

In 1848, the Parliament of Frankfurt proclaimed the liberty of religion as a fundamental law of the Confederation, adopting a formula which was drawn up by Catholic divines and canonists, and which was afterwards incorporated in the Prussian constitution, and in the Austrian constitution of 1849. Dr. Gasser, of Brixen, one of the representatives of Tyrol, spoke against the application of this law to his own province. Separated by their mountains from the rest of Germany, their pride and their strength lay, he said, in the memory of their own achievements, and in their reverence for the olden time; and the unity of religion belonged to the notion of the olden time. "I well know that the principle of the liberty of conscience is a political necessity for Germany, and I know its value; but I must demand that in extending this law to Tyrol, the peculiar circumstances of that country be taken into consideration. A single confession reigns throughout the land;



and the unity of faith is more dear to the inhabitants than the beauty of their mountains." He concluded by demanding that time should be given in order that the people might be gradually prepared for their new position, and that the change might be introduced with care and with forbearance. A deputy from Italian Tyrol contradicted this speech, and repudiated the notion that caution was needed; but the representative of Innsbruck supported Dr. Gasser.

The orator who protested at Frankfort against the disturbance of the ancient unity of faith in Tyrol is now Prince-Bishop of Brixen, and with the great authority and influence of his new position he has resisted the legislation of Vienna as he did the legislation of Frankfort. He brought forward in the Assembly at Innsbruck two motions: one for a separate Assembly for the Italian part of the principality, which had refused to join the German; the other that Protestants should not enjoy the liberty of public worship, or of holding land in Tyrol. This was voted by the Assembly, but afterwards rejected by the Emperor; and a general agitation has ensued among the people of Tyrol, which has alienated them from the dynasty and from the new institutions of the empire. In theory, the Tyrolese are undoubtedly right to oppose the introduction of new religions; but the question is, whether that principle can be admitted in a province of a free and united empire. The dispute is between autonomy and sovereignty: whether religious liberty is a constitutional, and therefore universal, principle in the state, or whether it is a subject for particular laws and local policy. In an absolute state there would be no difficulty, because the various territories, being united, not under a common law, but under a single will, may be as dissimilar as possible. Whilst the Emperor Nicholas was persecuting Latin Catholicism in Lithuania, he was protecting it in Poland; and the Polish censorship excluded or expurgated books that attacked the Church, while the Russian censorship condemned those which defended her. But in Austria the concession to the Protestants was in great measure made for the purpose of influencing the province,—namely,

for the conciliation of Hungary. The patent for the German and Slavonic provinces was a consequence of that for Hungary. It was, therefore, an imperial measure. If it could have been left to provincial arrangement, if Tyrol could be allowed to settle the question for itself, the same privilege might have been given to Hungary, where there is less ill-will between Catholics and Protestants than in almost any country, and where the problem would have been easily solved. By making the patent of toleration an act of sovereignty, the Emperor made it a principle of state, and removed it from the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities.

The immediate office of the several assemblies was to elect the representatives of the several provinces to the Lower House of the imperial Parliament, which was summoned for the 29th of April. When this was done they were prorogued. But the Hungarian Diet made no election, and spent the month of April in demonstrations of hostility to the new system; but proceeded to no important action until the Austrian Reichsrath met. The agitation was more active in the counties, where the constitution of February was declared illegal, and where the payment of taxes was refused. Deak's party did not at that time encourage the refusal of taxes, and they had not yet acquired the lead which they afterwards obtained. Meantime attempts were made by the Hungarians in the government to obtain a security that, if the laws of 1848 were conceded, they would be revised. But the government in general held aloof, and waited till the Diet should take a decisive step.

*May 1st.* The Reichsrath, which had met on the 29th of April, was opened by the Emperor. As the representatives of a large portion of the empire did not appear, the assembly was not addressed by the Emperor as the council of the empire; and he had not appointed to the House of Peers the contingent of those states which had refused to elect deputies. At Vienna the imperial speech made a favourable impression, and the debates were followed with the warmest interest. The great question of the day was started at once: on the 2d of May a Centralist deputy asked the

minister to explain his position and his intention towards Hungary. Schmerling proposed to reply, if required, on a future day. The Hungarian Chancellor, Vay, offered his resignation, and the result was that no answer was ever given. On the 3d, the other great topic—of the relation of unity to autonomy—was brought forward by the Centrifugal party. They demanded that in each committee members should be selected from each part of the empire, and that the provinces should continue to be individually represented in the Assembly. This made the deputies representatives, not of the nation, but of their constituents; and made the Reichsrath the council, not of the State, but of the several provinces. It cut off the constitutional element in the government, and reduced it to a modification of the old system of estates. Burke has laid down on this subject the natural law of all constitutional governments. "Government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, and not of inclination; and what sort of reason is that, in which the determination precedes the discussion; in which one set of men deliberate and another decide; and where those who form the conclusion are perhaps three hundred miles distant from those who hear the arguments? . . . Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest,—that of the whole; where not local purposes, not local prejudices, ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole." "If we do not permit our members to act upon a very enlarged view of things, we shall at length infallibly degrade our national representation into a confused and scuffling bustle of local agency. When the popular member is narrowed in his ideas, and rendered timid in his proceedings, the service of the crown will be the sole nursery of statesmen." Clam-Martinitz urged that the demand should be granted, not on principle, but as a provisional regulation, in order to avoid the discussion of the question involved in it.

Meanwhile the Hungarian Diet was considering the mode in which it should announce the rejection of the constitution of February, and of the constitutional unity of the empire. The majority of the deputies, led by the pardoned traitor Teleky, were anxious for a breach with Austria, in hopes of forming an independent state which, with the annexed territories, would be nearly equal in population to Spain or Prussia. The moderate party, led by Deak, wished for the personal union with Austria, and sought by concessions to obtain the coöperation of the other. Teleky's antecedents were an obstacle in the way of a coalition with men who were the defenders of historic rights. His position towards the Emperor, to whom he had personally sworn fidelity; to the emigration, whose designs he had undertaken to execute; to the moderates, whose policy secured to Hungary the sympathy of Europe, and with whom he could not join,—was untenable and desperate. On the 8th of May he committed suicide. Such was the feeling in Hungary that the clergy joined in patriotic demonstrations over the grave of the rebel who was a suicide and a Protestant.

On the 13th Deak proposed his address to the Emperor. He demanded a Hungarian ministry and the whole legislation of 1848, the right of voting soldiers and money, the restoration of the dependent territories, the withdrawal of all decrees subsequent to the revolution. "We will share with none but our own king the right of making laws for Hungary. Our government and administration can be dependent on nobody but the King of Hungary, and cannot be joined to that of other countries. We will therefore take no part in the Reichsrath, or in any imperial representation. . . . We are only ready to enter from time to time into communication with the constitutional nations of the hereditary lands, as one independent free people with another." These demands amounted to independence. Deak could not stop short of the laws of 1848, for he required a constitutional security against the arbitrary system of bureaucratic administration, and against the democratic centralisation of the Austrian liberals. If he had appealed to the constitution before 1848, he



would not have had the nation with him, and he would have demanded an impossibility; for the revolution destroyed the whole social fabric on which the old Magyar system rested, and there were no materials to reconstruct it. The constitution of 1848 was revolutionary and impracticable; but it afforded a basis on which modifications might be introduced.

*May 16th.* The opposite party moved a resolution as an amendment to the address. In substance, Deak's plan contained all they wanted; but they wished it to be in such a form as should make it an act of hostility to the crown. Eötvös spoke on the following day. The February constitution, he said, was impracticable, and no general constitution was to be desired. The connection of one part of the empire with the Germanic confederation rendered the political union of Austria impossible, while the union of Austria would render the national unity of Germany impossible. The claim of Hungary is founded on the right of national, not of political unity, and is therefore a common cause with the unity of Italy and of Germany. This was in reality more than Deak had offered; or at least it was more clear and more definite. On these principles it is obvious that the independent Hungarian government would refuse troops and taxes for the defence of Venetia, and the German provinces were made over to the future state which is to be the result of the unity of Germany. So great a concession to their views ought to have disarmed the extreme party; for Eötvös practically surrendered the historic-conservative basis of his policy. Admitting the right of each nationality to govern itself as a political unit, he preferred the natural physiological definition of the nation to the historical and political definition. His nation is the product of the family, not of the state. This is the fullest negation of history and tradition, and a thoroughly democratic idea. The result of the long discussion was, that a portion of the party of the resolution did not vote, and the address was determined on by a majority of 155 to 152, on the 5th of June. On the discussion in detail, however, Deak was defeated. It was resolved that the act of abdication should not be consi-

dered until the laws of 1848 were restored. Francis Joseph was therefore not regarded as King of Hungary, and his title was not given to him. In this form the address was adopted, June 16th, in the Lower Chamber, and on the 20th by the magnates.

*June 30th.* The Emperor replied that he would not receive the address as it stood, and demanded that it should be again presented to him with the alteration of the form. The rescript was moderate in tone, and so conclusively right that it proved a blow to the advanced party in Hungary, who had carried the change against Deak. On the 2d July, Rechberg communicated the rescript to the Upper House, where it was received with acclamation; and Count Hartig at once carried an address of thanks to the Emperor for his fidelity to the constitutional unity of the state. Schmerling read the rescript in the second Chamber, where it was well received by all but the Poles and Bohemians; and when the resolution of the other House was known, a similar address was voted.

These addresses of the Reichsrath, in support of the constitution against the Magyars, were equivalent to declarations of confidence in the minister who is the author of the statute of February. Schmerling obtained the zealous and indignant support of the Austrians by the patience with which he allowed the schemes of the Hungarians to ripen and to display themselves. All who cared for constitutional government in Austria put themselves on his side; and he is able to reckon on the national spirit of the dominant race, on the idea of the empire, and on the representative principle to maintain the struggle. The policy of governing one part of the monarchy by the other is dangerous and unsound; but it has become, by the October constitution, the only resource by which the unity of the state can be preserved.

On the same day Schmerling said, that, although the ministers were virtually responsible, no law on the subject could be presented in the Reichsrath until it had obtained its full competency, and embraced the whole empire. This speech, which made the definitive establishment of the constitutional system dependent on the defeat of the Hungarian move-

ment, gave a further power to the ministry; for it enlisted on their side, not only the cause of unity, but the cause of liberty. At the same time, the great military commands in Hungary were given to the most resolute and devoted officers that could be found.

*July 4th.* The Poles and Bohemians, who had refused to support the address, explained that it was not from disloyalty, but because no opportunity had been allowed them of making their reservations and conditions in favour of the claims of nationality.

At Pesth, the party of Deak, whose ascendancy was confirmed by the rejection of the address, on the ground of a change which had been made in their despite, carried the required modification. On the 5th of July, even the loudest advocates of the resolution consented silently to the motion. From this moment, however, the councils of the Hungarians ceased to be divided, and all combined in support of a common policy. But the feeling in the country was not so unanimous as that of the Diet. The new national system for the administration of justice, and the retirement of the German bureaucracy, had deprived the people of the unpopular but salutary order and regularity which was the merit of Bach. There was much disturbance and disorder, and large interests were injured by the agitation. The organ of the moderate party complained that there was so much disaffection towards the movement, that the Emperor would have no difficulty in finding instruments to carry out a different policy. In the Croatian assembly, when the news arrived that the address had been refused by the Emperor, a member proposed to suspend the discussion relative to annexation with Hungary, and it was replied that the Magyars would doubtless retire from their false position, and make the necessary alteration.

On the 13th July, the Assembly decided in favour of separation from Hungary.

*July 8th.* The address was presented to the Emperor at a private audience by the Presidents of the two Houses of the Diet, Count Apponyi and Coloman Ghiczy. Francis Jo-

seph promised a speedy reply; but in the course of conversation he informed the deputation that the demand of a Hungarian ministry could not be conceded. "I cannot govern one empire," he said, "with two ministries."

The German and the Hungarian ministers separately drew up a reply to the address. Whilst the deliberation was going on, the Hungarian Chancellor, who had countersigned the rescript by which the address had been originally returned, was in negotiation with the leaders at Pesth to find a common basis of agreement. At the same time he ordered that the military should be called in to enforce the payment of taxes where it was refused. He proposed a draft reply substantially in harmony with the ideas of Deak, by which the conduct of the army and the administration of finance were alone reserved to the Emperor; and the Hungarians were requested to overlook the acts of the last twelve years, in consideration of the Emperor's willingness to grant oblivion of the events of 1848 and 1849. The passage concerning the disposal of the army was probably directed against an obvious consequence of the theories of Eötvös, that the Diet might make conditions as to the purpose for which the Hungarian troops should be employed.

Vay's plan was withdrawn, and one drawn up by Szechen substituted for it by the Hungarians. Count Szechen is, of all the magnates, least a Hungarian patriot, and most an imperial statesman. The seat of his ambition is at Vienna; the aim of his career to rule the destinies, not of his country, but of Austria; and some believe that he will be Foreign Minister, if an administration should be formed by Clam-Martinitz. He it was who compelled Count Rechberg to draw up the statute of October, and both he and Vay assisted to draw up that of February; but he alone signed it. His colleague managed to be out of the way at the time. Szechen's draft was naturally more conservative and more statesman-like than Vay's, which was a complete capitulation. It insisted upon the real union of Austria and Hungary as distinguished from the personal union; but it conceded the laws of 1848, and made no



mention of the statutes of October and February. This scheme was rejected on the 13th July by the German ministers. For a moment an attempt appears to have been made by Schmerling and Szechen to come to an agreement on a plan by which a ministerial capacity should be given to the great offices of the Hungarian crown, the Chancellor, the *Judex Curie*, and the *Tavernicus*. But no arrangement was possible on the conditions which Deak had made the rule of all the Hungarian patriots. The issue was on both sides a ministerial question. Vay wished to stand by his first scheme, but he consented to adopt that of Szechen; and when it was rejected, they both resigned.

*July 17th.* The Emperor adopted the reply that was drawn up by Schmerling, and accepted the resignation of the Hungarian ministers. The other great dignitaries, Apponyi and Mailath, were induced to remain in office. Count Forgach, the Governor of Bohemia, became Chancellor of Hungary, Count Maurice Esterhazy succeeded Szechen. Both these changes were injurious to the government. Forgach, though a Hungarian, served in 1849 against the revolution, whilst his predecessor Vay had been sentenced to imprisonment for sedition. Szechen was identified with the statute of October, which conferred on Hungary its new independence. His successor was only known in the Austrian diplomacy.

*July 22d.* The imperial rescript was communicated to the Diet at Pesth. The position of Schmerling is, that the states of the empire are united together, and that one part cannot alter the fundamental laws without general consent. The laws of 1848, putting Hungary in an exceptional position, were invalid, because they were inconsistent with the character of a constitutional state. This was felt at that time; and on the 1st of May 1848, the estates of Lower Austria (Vienna) protested against the union of Transylvania with Hungary, as involving the dissolution of the empire. If Austria is a constitutional empire, the sovereign cannot deal with one part of it, except with the consent and for the advantage of the whole. If the Hungarian claims are granted, the constitution must

fall to the ground. Whilst the Hungarian statesmen are forced into a coalition with the revolution, the Austrian Government is obliged to rely on the party of parliamentary centralisation. The theory of nationality puts Eötvös in the wrong, and the theory of centralisation is the error of Schmerling. The Hungarians are wholly justified in their resistance to the Centralists, but that is equally the position of the party of self-government, who are free from the taint of revolution. The Austrians are right in insisting upon unity, but this is likewise the view of Clam-Martinitz, who does not push unity to uniformity, or rest concentration in administrative centralisation. In this conflict of two extreme principles, the right is practically with those whose victory is necessary for the preservation of the state, and the failure of Schmerling would be a far greater calamity than the loss of Lombardy. But the victory would be too dearly bought by the supremacy of that form of Liberalism which is the common enemy of the Austrian and of the English state. Schmerling has exhibited only his great abilities in political management and tactics, and is assuredly the right man for the crisis. But the state will be ruined by the principle of its constitution, if the party which combines progress with tradition and unity with self-government fails to obtain the lead.

*August 8th.* Deak's address in reply to the imperial rescript was unanimously adopted, and the adoption of the Austrian constitution imperatively refused. The Primate had spoken in favour of conciliation, but the address was adopted by the magnates on the 10th. It repeats with great fullness the old arguments, seeks by an appeal to Bohemia to create a diversion against the Emperor, denies the legality of the acts of the government in Hungary, and defies its power. On the 14th, the address was presented to the Emperor. So far the conflict has proceeded between self-government and centralisation, and between constitutionalism and the theory of nationalities.

*August 21st.* When it became known at Pesth that the Diet would be dis-

solved, a protest was proposed by Deak, and adopted by both Houses. Its purport was, that the Diet could not be legally dissolved, according to the law of 1848, until it had discussed the accounts of the past, and the budget of the current, year. This had not been done, and could not be done so long as the Diet had not recovered all its rights, or so long as there was no Hungarian ministry. Further, the law requires that a new Diet shall meet within three months of the dissolution of the last. Against the breach of all these laws and privileges the Diet solemnly protested, declaring that it stood by the old laws, but could not resist force: "Our only weapons," said Deak, "are the law and the justice of our cause; and leaning upon them we confront the weapons of force. It is an old saying, and one which, as history shows, hardly ever deceives, that in the end victory is always with the just cause. On this we must build our hopes. In order safely to occupy that ground, we must not and cannot ever, under any pretext, abandon the footing of perfect legality, for that is the only field which, without armed power, and against armed power, we shall be able to maintain. . . . I trust that the local authorities and the individual citizens will faithfully follow the example of the Diet. While holding fast by the basis of the law, abiding by it, and never departing from it, they will neither grant nor obey any thing which is against the law, or which deviates from it in any way whatever." Thus the eloquent leader of the Hungarian nation takes his stand against the improvements introduced by the imperial government on the very ground that was taken by the absolute Legitimists, or in England by the Tories, against every reform. This would be utterly inconsistent with his former career, if we did not learn from his more speculative and less diplomatic colleague Eötvös that the appeal to law is only an artifice for the realisation of the revolutionary idea of the unity of nationalities.

*August 22d.* The imperial commissary brought the rescript dissolving the Diet, and announcing that a new Diet would probably be summoned in six months. In the debate on the protest, the Tavernicus, Count Mai-

lath, said that he believed means of reconciliation might yet be found; and he acknowledged that the laws of October and of February were inconsistent.

The imperial message to the Reichsrath on the dissolution was well received, and addresses were carried in both Houses in acknowledgment and support of the policy. The message points out the complete disorder and anarchy which, in great part of Hungary, has been the result of the measures of the Diet. Whereas Hungary alone had forfeited its privileges by the revolution of 1848, which was a thorough breach of law and of tradition, Hungary received by the new measures more than any other part of the monarchy. But the incorporation of the institutions of that country in the new constitutional system given to the whole empire is necessary for the unity, the credit, and the parliamentary government of Austria.

#### *The War in America.*

For six weeks after Mr. Lincoln's installation at Washington, it was doubtful whether the secession of the South would be accomplished without war. The Border States, especially Virginia, were actively employed in preserving peace, and the Government of the United States were not prepared with a policy to meet a contingency of which there was no example in their history. But the Seceding States never for a moment wavered in their determination; they refused to consider any terms of compromise, and sought not the redress of injuries or the alteration of laws, but separation from the North. When provisions were running short at Fort Sumter, it was resolved that an attempt should be made to furnish the garrison with supplies, in order that the Union should not submit to outrage or appear to surrender its rights. On the appearance of the Federal fleet, the Confederates commenced the bombardment of the fort; the Government at Washington had not decided on war, the fleet took no part in the defence, and Anderson surrendered, April 13th.

*April 15th.* Mr. Lincoln issued a



proclamation calling for a militia force of 75,000 men in order to retake the fortresses and property of the United States, and "to suppress combinations" in the South. At the same time he summoned an extraordinary Session of Congress to meet on the 4th of July. Though this was in fact a declaration of war, the force demanded was manifestly inadequate to the task of subduing the Southern States, and the President was altogether ignorant of the magnitude of the enterprise on which he was engaging. It soon became apparent that he had not foreseen the effect which the fall of Fort Sumter would have upon the States. The demand for men was addressed to all, and each State had to come to a decision. The avowal of a policy of coercion turned against the Union the central Slave States, that were not inclined to join the Plantation States. Missouri refused to supply troops. Kentucky refused likewise, and declared herself neutral. Arkansas, Tennessee, North Carolina, successively joined the Southern Confederation. Above all, the State which had seemed for a time to hold the balance between North and South, and had been the head-quarters of negotiation, and which must inevitably become the seat of war, declared against the Union, blocked up the Naval Dockyard at Norfolk, and seized the United States arsenal at Harper's Ferry. But Virginia was herself divided. The western portion of the State is not interested in the slave trade, and is so nearly surrounded by the States of the Union, that it had strong inducements to go with the North. This policy became by degrees more certain and more definite, and when the decisive moment came, many western counties declared that they did not follow the remainder of the State. Thus by a strange complication the revolution which has been made on behalf of the sovereign unity of the several States has in one conspicuous instance led to the destruction even of that authority and territorial unity which every party concedes to each State. And this division of opinion in Virginia likewise explains why she was so eager to intervene between the opposite parties, and to

prevent a breach. The position of Maryland was even more peculiar. For Maryland, which is famous in history as a Catholic colony, and as the first place where religious liberty was established in the modern times, is the most northerly Slave State, and neither a great producer nor a great consumer of slave labour. Her interests, therefore, are in no degree bound up with those of the South; but the instincts of all slave-owners are against a government of Abolitionists, and politically the sympathies of Maryland are against democratic absolutism. Hence Baltimore, which of all the great American cities is nearest to the capital, has been distracted by the meeting of the hostile views. The State voted indeed by a majority in favour of the Union, but the vote was accompanied by an earnest appeal to the President to desist from coercive measures. The feeling in Baltimore itself was strong against the Government. The Federal troops as they marched through the city were attacked, and blood was shed; the bridges were broken by the people, and the railway cut up. For some time the troops had to go from Philadelphia to Washington without touching Baltimore. At length the disturbance was so great that severe measures were taken against the Secessionists, and a military government was established. As large masses of troops were concentrated about Washington, the country parts of Maryland were quiet, but their loyalty to the Union has become more and more doubtful.

But the North-Eastern States vigorously responded to the President's call. Massachusetts, the home of theoretical, *doctrinaire* abolitionism, and on former memorable occasions the foremost upholder of the centralist principles, through her great representative, Daniel Webster, was the most prompt of all in sending regiments to protect the capital. Pennsylvania and Ohio followed, with thirty regiments. New York hesitated for a moment, and doubts were entertained whether the exporting interest would not submit to the power of cotton; but this did not last long. The resources of the Empire State, with its population of near four millions, and its enor-

mous wealth, were tendered with enthusiasm to the Federal Government, until at last, when the stake was forgotten in the excitement of the contest, and interest was silenced by passion, New York became the centre of the movement on behalf of the Union. It is a curious, though perhaps at this time an idle, speculation whether at some future day the great city, which is rich and strong enough to rule the Union, may not become the seat of government. Washington was an artificial and sentimental creation; it has never thriven, and it is likely to become a frontier town on an insecure frontier, and within sight of a threatening neighbour. In a long war it will be a very bad basis of operations, and if the Union is ultimately divided, it will become insupportable to Federalists to govern the Northern half from the former capital of a greater confederacy. Whatever the military issue of the war may be, there can be no doubt as to its constitutional results. Those who come after Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Seward, and General Scott, will exercise a less extensive, but certainly a far greater authority than their predecessors in office. The power of a government that has waged a great war, commanded an army of 500,000 men, introduced a heavy system of direct taxation, and created a national debt of European proportions, belongs to a totally different category than that which was jealously conceded to Washington, and which his successors down to Buchanan have only increased by corruption and by servility. This augmentation of the central power will be the result of the principle of pure democracy and of the absolute supremacy of the people, for that is the question at issue between the North and the South. Consequently the increased power will require an increased control. It would be inconsistent with the democratic principle, which is the mainspring of the war, that the state should be allowed to separate itself from the nation, and that the government should have a will distinct from that of the people. Hitherto the people have exercised their power over the executive by the right of election. But the security that the man of their

choice would continue the organ of their policy consisted only in the mediocrity of his powers, and in the hope of reelection. Even this last security has been given up by common consent, as is seen from Mr. Buchanan's self-denying declaration, and from the provision in the Constitution of Montgomery. During his occupancy of the White House, the President is actually inviolable and beyond control. In the desolate scene of his authority there is not even the constitutional restraint of a mob. In this remoteness from the public view there is something autocratical and suspicious. It has been one of the characteristics of European absolutism that it could not govern from a capital, unless it was a military despotism. The Escurial, Versailles, Potsdam, are common signs of this general truth, and the people became conscious of it when they brought Lewis XVI. to Paris. Such power as the United States Government will in future possess cannot, in a democracy, be trusted out of sight, or out of reach, of the real sovereign. There is much to make it likely that the future capital will be one of the great cities, and it is hardly conceivable that any city would dispute the prize with New York, which is large enough to silence jealousy, and to represent no particular interests. The vigour with which it supports the Union is peculiarly valuable, because it possesses in its large Irish population the best materials for a regular army.

The refusal of the Slave States to furnish their contingent compelled the Government to demand more than their fair proportion of men from the States that continued faithful. Here there was no difficulty in obtaining them, and numerous regiments of volunteers were immediately formed, who engaged to serve for three months. This happened in the middle of April; consequently their term of service expired in July, at the very moment when they were required to act. As a large regular army is contrary to the nature of a democracy, both on political grounds and from the inconsistency of submission to stern discipline by men who possess individual sovereignty,



the only resource is an army of volunteers serving for a very limited period. But the impatience of discipline diminishes the efficiency of the volunteers, and the officers in command at Washington placed very little reliance upon them. When hostilities commenced, and the Confederate forces occupied the line of the Potomac, the capital was for a moment exposed to a great danger. This was averted by the speedy arrival of the newly-raised regiments; but they were not fit to carry on the war, and on the 3d of May President Lincoln called for an addition of 23,000 men to the regular army. General Scott did not wish to invade the South until a powerful regular force was organised, and that would be long after the volunteers, whom the first moment of excitement had called to arms, had returned to their homes.

Meantime the Southern Congress met at Montgomery on the 29th of April. It had been elected for the purpose of accomplishing the independence of the South, and proved, therefore, most serviceable in assisting the Government to prepare means of defence. Mr. Davis in his message demanded a loan of 50,000,000 dollars, and repeated the old arguments of Calhoun to prove that secession is a constitutional right. At that time he could only announce the accession of Virginia, but shortly after the wisdom of his policy in precipitating a crisis was proved by the detachment of all the six central Slave States from the North. When Fort Sumter was attacked, Mr. Davis was the ruler of seven States, with an area of 560,000 square miles, and a population of five millions. The result of the declaration of war was to separate from the Union six more States, with an area of 315,000 square miles, and a population of six millions and a half. In consequence of this altered state of affairs, it was announced that the seat of Government would be removed to Richmond. Commissioners had already started for Europe to recommend the interests of the new Confederation to the Great Powers, and especially to England and France.

Great importance was justly attached to the opinion of this country. Regarding secession as rebellion, the

people of the North expected the support of English sympathy in their struggle, and imagined that the policy of non-interference would not prevent the exercise of our moral influence in their behalf. There was much doubt and hesitation, and considerable ignorance in England as to the nature of the dispute. Our antipathy against absolute monarchy does not extend to absolute democracy, and the vulgar and superficial Liberalism of the country was on the side of the North. The Government succeeded in preventing a discussion which was more than once pressed upon them by the partisans of the South. They recognised the rights of the South as belligerents, and proclaimed, 13th May, an entire neutrality. Undoubtedly this was the only prudent course, and it furnished no justification of the violent ill-will displayed by the Federalists against England. A war with England would have aroused a far stronger feeling than has been displayed for the preservation of the Union; and a great proportion of the Secessionists would have been rallied to its banner in the presence of a foreign foe. There were two conclusive reasons, therefore, against interference in favour of the South,—the certainty of war, and the danger of checking secession. For there is no doubt that both our interests and our political principles are on the side of the South. This was understood by Ministers; and they believed that the Secessionists were right in their interpretation of the Constitution—a point on which they may be mistaken, but which is of no importance whatever. The great difficulty of the slave question was a further reason for extreme caution in the expression of opinion; but it is only fair to say, that the Government was not carried away by a cry which would have been popular, and that their American views were in happy contradiction with the principles which Lord John Russell has laid down in his Italian despatches.

In the first week of May Washington was secure against any attack which the Confederates were then in a condition to make; but the presence of a Southern corps at Harper's Ferry, and on the heights immediately opposite the capital, was a constant menace. It was necessary for the honour of

the North, and for the permanent safety of the seat of Government, to drive the enemy from the line of the Potomac. On the 23d of May the Federalists occupied the right bank, and the Secessionists retired, still holding Harper's Ferry. Whilst the Federal troops were gradually surrounding them at this point, and whilst continual skirmishing was going on along the line of outposts, the first serious encounter took place at Great Bethel, near Richmond, on the 9th of June, and ended in the repulse of the Federalists. On the 16th Harper's Ferry was evacuated.

*July 4th.* Congress met at Washington, and received the President's message. In this moderate but most awkwardly written document Mr. Lincoln reviewed the events of his administration, and justified his policy. He had intended at first to use no coercive measures against secession, but to leave it to time to demolish. He "sought only to hold the public places and property not already wrested from the Government, and to collect the revenue, relying for the rest on time, discussion, and the ballot-box." Fort Sumter could not be relieved before the provisions were exhausted; to remove the garrison would have been fatal to the position and claims of the Union; it was resolved, therefore, to provision it. When this determination was announced, and before it could be executed, the fort was attacked and captured. This forced the Union to try the issue of the sword; "and this issue embraces more than the fate of these United States. It presents to the whole family of man the question whether a constitutional republic or democracy—a government of the people by the same people—can or cannot maintain its territorial integrity against its own domestic foes . . . . It forces us to ask: 'Is there in all republics this inherent and fatal weakness?' Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence?" Here we have the measure of the political insight of the man who, in the great crisis of America, was the ruler of the state. It is remarkable that the problem as he puts it is precisely that which was created by Protestantism.

Mr. Lincoln proceeds to give his theory of the Constitution, which certainly admits of a better defence. The Union, according to its last President, was anterior to the States composing it. The colonies formed the Union, and the Union converted them into States, giving each of them whatever of independence and liberty it has. This is the extreme logical result of the democratic theory, according to which the whole is author of the parts, and absolute master of them. In the face of such a doctrine it is obvious that state rights are the only security for freedom, and the Southern States need only admit Mr. Lincoln's as the true interpretation of the original Constitution in order to justify their secession. The conclusion of the message was a demand for 400,000 men, and 400,000,000 dollars. Congress immediately voted 500,000 men (40,000 for the regular army), and 500,000,000 dollars. Whilst the Government endeavoured by the activity of its preparations to keep pace with the demands of the party of action, and to crush the opposition of ten or eleven Western Senators, headed by Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky, whose attitude betrayed the real character of the neutrality of his State; and whilst in the valley of the Missouri scattered corps fought with little bloodshed and varied success, to determine the wavering loyalty of the Unionists,—the United States army commenced a general advance against the Secessionists.

The Appalachian range traverses Virginia in two parallel lines of hills, the Alleghanies and the Blue Ridge. The Alleghanies form on their north-western slope, which falls gradually towards the valley of the Ohio, the rich agricultural district of Western Virginia, which has followed in the present conflict the natural instinct of its geographical position. Beverly is on this side. The Blue Ridge runs parallel with the Alleghanies, and leaves Virginia at Harper's Ferry, where the Potomac cuts through it at its confluence with the Shenandoah. The country between the two lines of mountain is the great valley district of Virginia; and here, on the road from Beverly to Harper's Ferry, is the town of Winchester. On the east of the Blue Ridge, on the line



from Harper's Ferry to Richmond, is the junction of the Winchester railway, near Manassas gap, within thirty miles of Washington. The Federalists, masters of both banks of the Potomac, operated in three bodies, separated by the two ranges of hills. The key of the southern position was strategically [at Manassas Junction, where troops could be easily poured in from the South; and here they had fortified themselves among thick woods, and with a deep river in their front. General Johnston was at Winchester with the corps which had evacuated Harper's Ferry, and there were several regiments beyond the Alleghanies. The task of the Federalists was to clear Western Virginia of these troops, to drive back Johnston, and then to fall on the enemy at Manassas. On the 12th and 13th of July General McClellan attacked the Secessionists near Beverly, repulsed them after very little resistance, and made himself master of North-Western Virginia. The military importance of this decided success was diminished by the fact that the Southern force was already in full retreat on Winchester. On the 17th General Patterson, who commanded a force of 20,000 Federalists at Harper's Ferry, advanced into the valley of Virginia, threatening to cut off Gen. Johnston from Manassas. At the same time the main army, under General McDowell, advanced from its position on the heights opposite Washington, pillaging and destroying as they went: "to the horror of every right-minded person," says the General with apparent irony, "several houses were broken open, and others were in flames, by the act of some of those who, it has been the boast of the loyal, came here to protect the oppressed and free the country from the domination of a hated party." On the 18th he had his first encounter with the enemy at Bull's Run, the stream that covered their position, and his troops were repulsed. A flag of truce was sent for the dead and wounded, but was not admitted by the Southern officers into their lines. Meantime the President compelled General Scott to give McDowell orders to attack, and on the 20th the enemy's position was reconnoitred. All day long the trains

were heard running into Manassas Junction, and the Federal commander knew that the encounter of the 18th had given the alarm, and that Johnston had escaped Patterson without firing a shot, and effected a junction with Beauregard and Lee. General Patterson had been unable to attack him, for at that very moment fifteen of his regiments declared that their time of service had expired, and refused to go into battle. For the same reason McDowell's attack was unsuccessful. He advanced early on the 21st July with the intention of turning the left of the enemy, who came out of their lines to meet him. Two hours after the firing began regiments of volunteers began to march away, as their time was up, but McDowell kept up the fight until late in the day, when his army became disorganised and fled. The loss was under 1500 men. Some corps of European troops covered the rear, and there was no pursuit. The officers made two vain attempts to rally the army, and at 11 o'clock at night Washington was filled with fugitives from the field of battle thirty miles off. The victory was not followed by an advance, and the Southern generals seem to have been ignorant of the extent of their success. Congress immediately voted 80,000 more men, and there was a threat that they would proclaim the emancipation of the slaves. The defeat occurring at the moment when many thousands of three months' men were leaving, seriously damaged the position of the North. In the Southern army, on the contrary, all the troops are engaged to serve as long as the war lasts. There was a contrast in the manner in which the news was received which shows the difference of character of the two parties. At the North there were recrimination, extraordinary excitement, and the utmost exaggeration. The responsibility for the advance was repudiated by the commander-in-chief, and his own plan of operations has been published. He designed to spend the summer in making the army efficient, and then to invade the South on the line of the Mississippi, whilst the fleet maintained a strict blockade. But he was not allowed to carry out his intention. "There are gentlemen in the

Cabinet," he says, "who know much more about war than I do, and who have far greater influence than I have in determining the plan of the campaign. . . . I shall do, or attempt, whatever I am ordered to do; but they must not hold me responsible. . . . I have lived long enough to know that human resentment is a very bad foundation for a public policy." McDowell was succeeded in the command by McClellan, and Patterson by Banks. In Western Virginia Resencranz pursued the success of McClellan, whilst in Pennsylvania a disturbance arose among the disbanded militia, which was calmed with difficulty.

The President of the Southern Confederation had arrived from Richmond on the day of the battle in time to take the command of the centre. The despatch in which he announced his victory on a hard-fought field was remarkable for the absence of triumph and exultation, and it was received by the Richmond Legislature in the spirit in which it was written. Mr. Memminger, of South Carolina, after reading the announcement of the victory that had been gained, went on to say: "But it has been at a cost that will bring sorrow into many families, wet with burning tears the cheeks of many widows and orphans, and into many happy homes bring grief and desolation; and I presume, sir, Congress will be little disposed on such an occasion to go on with their usual business." He then moved three resolutions. The first, "That we recognise the hand of the Most High God, the King of kings and Lord of lords, in the glorious victory with which He has crowned our arms at Manassas, and that the people of these Confederate States are invited, by appropriate services on the ensuing Sabbaths, to offer up their united thanksgivings and prayers for this mighty deliverance." Secondly, "That we deeply deplore the necessity which has washed the soil of our country with the blood of so many of our noble sons, and that we offer to their respective families and friends our warmest and most cordial sympathies." The third resolution provided for the wounded; and then Congress adjourned. All our information concerning the Southern

States comes through the North, and is very scanty. It may be doubted whether this is a disadvantage to them.

The natural history of confederations is so little known, that it may throw some light on the events in America to recall the characteristic points in the similar movement which took place not many years since in the Swiss cantons. The Swiss Radicals, like the Republicans in the United States, maintain the principle of the absolute right of majorities over each separate canton, and over every corporation. But, in fact, the theory that a minority has no rights which the majority may not violate or abolish, is equivalent to the right of might. They were therefore perfectly justified, on their own principles, in repudiating the will of the legal majority when it was against them: what they could carry by a vote they invested with the authority of law; when the vote was against them they made a tumult, upset the government, and carried their measures. The organised insurrection of the free corps accordingly became a regular institution in the constitutional existence of Switzerland, and revolutions were an instrument of government. That the Catholic Church would be hated by a party of this kind is not merely to be gathered from their having summoned Strauss and Zeller, the ablest of the German Atheists, to professorships, in their universities. The Church has rights which are inviolable, and teaches the moral duty of respecting the rights of others. For political as well as religious reasons, therefore, her existence was intolerable to the Radicals. In Aargau the Catholics were oppressed; a strong force came from Berne to put down their resistance, and in the presence of a large Radical army the abolition of the monasteries was decreed. The Diet declared the act illegal, but the victors were too strong to submit. In opposition to these proceedings, the zealous Catholics of Lucerne determined to call in the Jesuits. The opposition of the moderate party was overruled, and the decree carried, 24th October, 1844, in spite of the warnings of the Secretary of State, whom the events which followed and fulfilled his prophecy drove into exile;



and who has since exercised, under Baron Bach, a powerful Catholic influence in the ministry of the interior at Vienna. "You are kindling," he said, "a fire among the people that will not die out, and will become the occasion of political intrigues and agitation that will keep our people in constant disturbance. Bring in the Jesuits, and you throw open to our enemies a vantage ground they would otherwise never obtain, where we shall be compelled to be always in arms against them, and where we cannot reckon on the support of our political friends." Up to this moment the European powers had sustained the Catholic cantons, and England had threatened the Swiss with the revocation of their neutrality, if they broke through the treaties to which the Catholics appealed. Metternich held the same language, but he did all he could to prevent the admission of the Jesuits. "The agitation against them," he said, "would be a pretext for other purposes, and would end in civil war." But the leader of the extreme party at Lucerne, Joseph Leu, was resolute. "The Radicals," he said, "love evil and hate good; they hate nothing more than the Jesuits; we cannot, therefore, do better than send for them."

Before long Leu was murdered in his bed, and a free corps marched against Lucerne. A distinguished Swiss officer who was then residing in the town has described, in an account of these transactions, his feelings on that occasion. "Without sharing the prejudices which pursue the Society, I thought the decree of the Great Council, which admitted them into the canton of Lucerne, untimely and unwise . . . . The Jesuits were not a cause, but a welcome occasion, for attacking central Switzerland. But for their admission it would have been impossible for Radicalism ever to have awakened such a fanatical spirit amongst the Protestant population against their peaceable fellow-citizens. It was most imprudent to give the enemy a standard round which they could rally . . . . I was not a Lucerner; I was bound by no positive obligation; my life, my military reputation, the existence of my family, were at stake, and it was very doubtful whether

these sacrifices would not be made in vain. But on which side was the right? Of that there could be no doubt, for those theories by which the minority must subject itself to the majority when that is radical, whilst in the opposite case the radical minority may take up arms,—these theories are too bald for me."

And so this honourable soldier accepted a command, and saved Lucerne. We shall not be misunderstood when we say that the Jesuits play the same part in the history of the dispute between Catholic and Radical Switzerland that belongs to slavery in the North-American contest. They were already tolerated in Friburg, and those who responded to the call of Lucerne were only a carriageful. But the self-government of the Southern States and of the Catholic cantons was as well worth fighting for as the twenty shillings of Mr. Hampden.

"Where the law is ruled over, and without authority, in that state," says Plato (*Laws*, iv. 7), "I see ruin at hand; but where it is master of the government, and the government the servants of the law, there I see safety, and all the good things the gods bestow on states."

As the Diet ended by approving of the suppression of the monasteries, and as new invasions of free corps were announced, the seven Catholic cantons threatened to secede from the Confederation, and formed a league among themselves to protect each other from the violation of their territory or of their Federal rights. The answer to this was, as in America, that the Diet might have been wrong, but that it could not be said not to have been competent. As this did not convince the Catholics, an army of 100,000 men was set on foot against them, encouraged by Lord Palmerston and the English *chargé d'affaires*, Sir Robert Peel, and the command was given to General Dufour, an old imperial officer and a friend of Lewis Napoleon. The *Journal de Genève* says, "Our respected fellow-citizen, Colonel Dufour, is placed in a very painful position by his appointment as general of the Federal troops. He disapproves, as much as we do, of the war he is to conduct. He has said so to every body, before and since his appointment; but he deems it his

duty as a soldier and servant of the Confederation to obey the call, and to make this grievous sacrifice."

After a short campaign the Catholics were defeated, and their league dissolved. While the analogy in principle is perfect, it must be observed that there is this difference between the policy of the Sonderbund and that of the Secessionists, that the former were ready to give way, provided their rights were secured, whilst the latter have sought independence unconditionally, not as the alternative of redress. Soon after these events a politician, who has never swerved in his love of freedom, though not always equally successful in defining it, Count de Montalembert, delivered, in the discussion of the Swiss question in the Chamber of Peers, the most eloquent of his speeches.

"The fight in Switzerland has not been for or against the Jesuits, for or against the national sovereignty; but for you and against you. It has been a fight for savage, intolerant,

irregular liberty, against a tolerant, regular, legal liberty, of which you are the defenders and the representatives in the world . . . . . I speak before the representatives of social, regular, and liberal order that has been defeated in Switzerland, and is menaced throughout Europe by a new invasion of barbarians . . . . . Last year there was a crime committed by absolute monarchies: it is committed this year by pretended Liberals, who are but tyrants of a worse kind. Then, as now, what have we seen?—the abuse of force, the suppression of freedom, of right, by a brutal and impious violence, the violation of sworn faith, the superiority of numbers raised into a dogma, and falsehood serving as a weapon and an ornament to violence . . . . . The crime of last year (the incorporation of Cracow), a crime of force, was committed in the name of force. This year it is a crime of despotism, with the addition of hypocrisy, committed in the name of freedom."



